

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

OU_164585

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

OSMANIA UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

150/B27C

Accession No. 21120

F. R. Barry.

Christianity and psychology.

Book should be returned on or before the date last marked below.

CHRISTIANITY & PSYCHOLOGY

LECTURES TOWARDS AN INTRODUCTION,

BY

F. R. BARRY, M.A., D.S.O.

PRINCIPAL OF KNUTSFORD

SCHOLAR AND SOMETIME FELLOW OF ORIEL COLLEGE, OXFORD

LONDON

STUDENT CHRISTIAN MOVEMENT

32 RUSSELL SQUARE, W.C. I

1923

First published April 1923.

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY
THE EDINBURGH PRESS, 9 AND 11 YOUNG STREET, EDINBURGH

CONTENTS

| CHAPTER | PAGE |
|--|------|
| PREFACE | v |
| INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| I. INSTINCT | 9 |
| II. THE UNCONSCIOUS | 23 |
| III. SUGGESTION AND WILL | 41 |
| IV. PSYCHOLOGY AND THE RELIGIOUS LIFE | 65 |
| 1. Facing our Discords | 71 |
| 2. Losing Ourselves | 74 |
| 3. Jesus and Human Personality | 78 |
| 4. Guilt and Forgiveness | 82 |
| 5. Christianity and Instinct | 87 |
| V. SUGGESTION AND PRAYER | 99 |
| VI. THE DANGER OF SUBJECTIVITY IN RELIGION | 117 |
| VII. CHRISTIAN POWER AND RESOURCES | 138 |
| VIII. PSYCHOLOGY AND THEOLOGY | 158 |
| IX. PSYCHOLOGY AND THE CHRISTIAN FAITH | 174 |
| BIBLIOGRAPHY | 193 |
| INDEX | 195 |

PREFACE

I HAVE had the greater part of this little book lying in a drawer for a couple of years. It did not seem to me worth publishing, and I was waiting for an opportunity to work it up into a more satisfactory form. It has, however, become very obvious that this opportunity will never come. Meanwhile I have had continual requests to try to put out something of this kind, and there is apparently a good deal of demand for it. So with considerable hesitation I have done just such revision as was possible, making such changes as were made necessary by further reading during the last two years, and consented to its publication.

It is meant to be very elementary and to serve the needs partly of the clergy and students for the Ministry, partly of the increasing number of people without any very great technical knowledge who are interested or disturbed by the religious bearings of Psychology. For those to whom the subject is quite new I have written (or rather compiled) the first three chapters ; but readers who know the main drift of the New Psychology can probably take them

CHRISTIANITY AND PSYCHOLOGY

as read. My own chief interest is in the later part of the book. There are plenty of people now who can interpret the religious life in psychological terms. What seems to be chiefly lacking is a readiness to face the much more thorny problem—the philosophical and theological implications of the new psychological theories. Psychology is certainly an ally, but a dangerous ally, to the Christian thinker, and it seems to me that unless we are careful we shall soon find a smile on the face of the tiger and the Christian theology “inside.” The philosophical position which a good deal of modern writing takes for granted appears to me to be frankly incompatible with the Christian view of the world. I have therefore tried to suggest some lines of approach for a fuller consideration of this matter. The greater part of this book was written before the appearance of Mr Pym’s well-known book. But in a sense what follows might be regarded as a sort of continuation of his, taking the argument about one step further.

Most of the following chapters started as lectures, some to clergy and some to undergraduates. As speech comes more naturally to me than writing I have not thought it necessary to disguise their original form too carefully. Chapter VII. was originally an address to the S.C.M. in the Guildhall

PREFACE

at Cambridge. The substance of Chapters VIII. and IX. was first published in *The Pilgrim*, and I am indebted to the Editor for allowing them to be reprinted.

I have given references for my statements so that the student can find his way about if he wishes to pursue the matter further. I have also acknowledged those debts of which I am conscious : but there are bound to be many more. I wish also to express my thanks to my friend Dr L. F. Browne, M.D., of the Tavistock Clinic, who has read through all the MS. and saved me from several technical "howlers." Mr J. G. Hillam of New College gave me most valuable secretarial help.

I cannot claim any expert knowledge and I am not writing a book for experts. I can only say that the practical part of this book has been verified in experience in the work on which I have lately been engaged. For the rest, I have merely done the best I could in the limitations of time and circumstances. How inadequate it is nobody knows more clearly than myself. I can but hope that my attempt may stimulate others better qualified to do it better.

F. R. B.

KNUTSFORD,

March 1923.

Christianity and Psychology

INTRODUCTION.

EVERY age seems to be dominated by some special branch of science, into terms of which it translates most of its thought. In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries we had the mathematical sciences with the Age of Reason as their resultant and a Religion of Enlightened Persons. The nineteenth was ruled by Biology, and spell-bound by the “blessed word” Evolution. But Psychology is sovereign in the twentieth. The practical needs of the war-situation—the exigencies of leadership and government, as well as the urgent problems of therapeutics created by what was commonly called “shell-shock”—focused attention on a neglected study, and provided on a scale unknown before the raw material for its exercise. It was with this as with most of our other problems: the war did not create, but it underlined them. And the terrific strain to which all were subjected, and from which we have none of us yet fully recovered, forced the mind back, as it were, upon itself, and created an unprecedented interest in the specifically mental sciences, as well as in spiritism and similar cults. We are all psychologists to-day. Psychology has become “popular” more rapidly than any science previously, and a positive spate of books pours forth from the publishers on psycho-analysis and the New Psy-

CHRISTIANITY AND PSYCHOLOGY

chology. The general public as well as professional thinkers are coming more and more under its spell. History and the social sciences, industrial organization, generalship, over and above the technique of medicine, are being re-thought in psychological terms. And the tide is advancing up the religious beaches. Theology cannot always play Canute. So that it seems imperatively necessary for all who are teachers or students of religion to begin at least to define our attitude to the conclusions of this new branch of knowledge—or we shall get our feet wet very badly.

The past is full of warning to us here. The notorious refusal of theology to countenance or try to come to terms with the Darwinian hypothesis vitiated the thought of half a century. The unreal separation between theology and natural science proved disastrous for both of them. Refusal to re-state always brings its nemesis. And when the evolution-theory percolated through to the man in the street it was supposed in a dim, unthinking way to have made Christianity incredible. For obscurantism is always suicidal. But a similar process is at work to-day. Already there is a tendency to think—and some psychologists assume it without argument—that the discoveries of the New Psychology have knocked the bottom out of the theologian's ark.

It would seem to be highly necessary, therefore, that we should keep abreast of this new science. We must avoid, no doubt, the exuberant claims which its devotees are apt to make for it. In some lectures that follow we shall criticize them. On the other hand, we must clear our minds at once of the suggestion that this new branch of learning is in any way

INTRODUCTION

opposed to the Christian faith. My chief idea in these lectures is certainly not that psychology should be studied in order that we should be on our guard against it—which seems an inadequate motive for seeking knowledge. It is rather that we cannot fail to find in it an ally of supreme importance both in study and in life. Indeed, so far is it from being true that the New Psychology is anti-religious—though some of its professors, no doubt, may be so—that the more one reads, the more the conviction grows that here we have simply in scientific form, reduced to technical term and law and formula, part of the secret of the way in which Our Lord during His ministry dealt with the lives of men and women. Nothing in our new knowledge goes beyond His incomparable intuitions. More and more, as one reads the well-known books, the old phrases of the New Testament come into the mind again with a new and, I think, very widely enriched meaning. It would be a tragedy if Christianity and its best handmaid among the sciences should come to regard one another as natural enemies. And I am convinced that nothing but added strength and depth and range in our religious lives, and even still more in ministerial work, can come from a careful study of psychology.

Several of our best psychologists take their researches to the point where conduct loses itself in Religion. But few, if any, so far as my knowledge goes, have yet attempted a co-ordination between psychology and the teaching of Jesus, or between psychological practice and Christian faith.¹ Dr

¹ This was written a good many months before the publication of Mr Pym's *Psychology and the Christian Life* (S.C.M.).

CHRISTIANITY AND PSYCHOLOGY

Hadfield felt himself bound, to our great loss, to confine himself to the findings of psychology in his masterly essay in *The Spirit*.¹ It is much to be hoped that he will soon take us further. Meantime, while we are still waiting for expert guidance, it seems worth while even for the layman to blunder in where the expert would fear to tread, and attempt to cut out the beginnings of a path.

The attempt seems to be worth making, even if demonstrably unsuccessful, in so far as it may lead other people to learn some lessons from our mistakes, and tackle the matter more satisfactorily.

Nobody who is not a specialist could try his hand with so specialized a subject without being conscious of terrible presumption. My excuse must be that my aim is merely to introduce the reader to the experts, who can correct for him any points in which what I shall say may prove misleading. I have also a feeling, for which I do not apologize, that the ordinary working parson, living intellectually from hand to mouth, and precluded from anything that can be called research, may conceivably perform some useful function in attempting to render the findings of the specialists (for whose work we can never be grateful enough) into terms of ordinary working religion. It has seemed to me that some of the best thinking has been done by men immersed in practical work, and therefore, perhaps, more eagerly alive to the need for positive and constructive thought.

I was therefore glad to receive an invitation which

¹ "The Psychology of Power" in *The Spirit*, edited by Streeter (Macmillan). Dr Crichton Miller has now promised us a volume on *The New Psychology and the Preacher*.

INTRODUCTION

forced me to try and arrange in coherent form some vague ideas that were shaping in my own mind. My hope is that I may help to persuade others to take up and follow out for themselves an extraordinarily important line of thought.

It is often objected that a superficial knowledge of modern psychology must be "dangerous." It probably is. But that is equally true of superficial knowledge of anything else. And the cure for it, surely, is not blank ignorance, but an attempt to gain rather deeper knowledge. All I shall try to do in these lectures is to supply some sort of introduction which may lead on to independent study. But let us be clear, from the start, what our purpose is.

I find myself in profound disagreement with a widespread modern tendency, of which M. Bergson is the leading exponent, to appeal back from Reason or Intelligence to what we must hold to be infra-rational faculties. It is a popular doctrine at the moment that, in the evolution of Intelligence, some power of the highest value has been lost, which it is the task of the moderns to recover. Primitive man was possessed, so the argument runs, of certain far more delicate intuitions, certain powers of communion with the unconscious, which the struggle for existence has driven under. Intelligence is but an external faculty, devised for meeting the demands of living : but the true inner life of man is impervious to it. So that the way of mental and moral progress is to turn our backs on this misleading tendency, and trust ourselves to the guidance of blind will—an idea to which I can attach no meaning—or plunge our-

CHRISTIANITY AND PSYCHOLOGY

selves again in the unconscious. Then we shall once again be masters in our own essential inner lives.

There is, no doubt, some fascination in this suggestion when we first encounter it. But it seems quite definitely reactionary. As I read it, the whole history of the development of the higher life, the whole extension of man's mastery over himself as well as his environment, the creation of all that is best and most divine in the civilizations of the world, has been due to the process which this theory criticizes, namely, the increasing exploration of the dim recesses of our minds by the light of conscious reason, their increasing control by the acts of conscious will. All creative art and all morality, all social and political achievements, are surely the creation of man's mind working from within outwards. It would appear that Christianity, with its cardinal belief in "losing the self to find it," and its worship of the Creative Reason made manifest in palpable life, is on the line of all real advance. The religions of mystery and superstition, of wizards that "peep and mutter," of intense emotional experiences untranslated into ethical act, definitely belong to the lower level from which true progress must always lead us on. Greece, as it seems to me, gave the lead, and the human race can never turn its back on her. This is not to argue for a so-called Rationalism—a dismal and superficial creed enough, which can only see one-tenth of the facts before it. But it is to base ourselves and our activities on the foundation of that by which man is man—self-conscious intelligence and directive Purpose. The exhortation "Know Thyself," which is now quoted so wearisomely often, is of value only in

INTRODUCTION

so far as the knowledge of ourselves when gained is to be used to make our conscious lives more rich, more harmonious and more effective. Self-revelation rather than self-inspection is of the very nature of personality.

Thus it is an entire misrepresentation to say that in urging people to study psychology we are asking them to paddle in the muddy stream of the unconscious. Our object is the very opposite. If in the course of our inquiries we have to go downstairs and explore the cellar, that is not because we like the cellar better or propose to use it instead of the drawing-room. It is rather that knowing the contents of our cellar, we can the better control it from the study. This, at least, is the standpoint of these lectures.

But, before we can decide what to do with the facts, we must first discover what the facts are—a useful step too frequently omitted. That is to say, before we can discuss the bearing of the Christian religion on the modern psychological discoveries, we must know, in outline, what those discoveries are. We shall therefore have to devote our first three lectures to an elementary explanation of the main facts to which I invite attention. In these I shall aim at nothing more ambitious than an attempt to reproduce from the vast amount of literature available the salient and most important results. It is hoped that any who are interested will then read the books concerned themselves, not being content to take it second-hand. Then, when we have made clear, in barest outline, some of the chief theories of psychology, we shall try to show how Christianity

CHRISTIANITY AND PSYCHOLOGY

comes in to meet the facts as thus presented to us. We shall deal first with practical religion. After that we shall try, greatly daring, to advance to more speculative ground, and endeavour to suggest some line of approach for the consideration of some problems which must confront the student of Theology as soon as he starts to read psychological books.

Out of all the range of possible points for discussion, we shall, in the main, confine ourselves to three, namely, Instinct, the Unconscious, and that vast world of new power and knowledge which is being unlocked for us by Suggestion.

We will start, then, at once by some outline notes on Instinct.

CHAPTER I.

INSTINCT.

IT is impossible to understand the theories of the New Psychology unless we start with some study of the Instincts. Their place is absolutely fundamental in the whole structure of the science. For in fact the starting-point of our whole inquiry must be the whole-hearted recognition of the hypothesis of "Evolution" in the sphere of mental and spiritual life. Not our bodies only, but our minds as well are continuous with those of our animal ancestors, and we forget or deny that at our peril. The human mind, with all its amazing capacities and its infinite possibilities is, nevertheless, regarded from one standpoint, a product of organic evolution. This was recognized by Darwin as much as fifty years ago. But it is only comparatively lately that psychologists have come to realize what this means for their own branch of study. Indeed, the "newness" of the new psychology mainly turns upon this very point. The old psychology was mainly occupied with the analysis of thought and knowledge. It was predominantly "intellectualist," occupied with the study of rational thought, *i.e.* with our conscious mental processes, working almost entirely by introspection. The "new" psychology starts from a frank acceptance of the evolutionary theory. And

CHRISTIANITY AND PSYCHOLOGY

this carries with it the corollary that the rational thought which formed the subject-matter of the inquiries of the older writers is itself the climax of a long development. From the simplest form of reflex-action in the most primitive types of organism, up to the god-like reason of a Socrates, is one unbroken process occupying millions of years. Thus man's self-conscious reason rests on a biological foundation. It is built over animal appetites, and surrounded with non-rational processes. It carries with it traces of its ancestry. Our mental lives, just like our bodily organs, have only come to be what they are by a long course of development, and in them we can read their history. It is, therefore, only to be expected that some of the peculiarities in the mental activities of men will be found to have their explanation in the animal basis upon which they rest, and the rational (partly at least) in the less-than-rational. How far this line of interpretation leads us we shall see as our argument proceeds. For, if you once admit biology into psychology at all, you cannot cut your subject into two halves. You cannot draw a line and say, On this side we have reason and self-consciousness and on the other side infra-rational tendencies. The two interpenetrate. On the one hand, every element in man's life is distinctively and specifically *human*: it is saturated by his specific character as a self-conscious being, with will and reason. But equally it must be recognized that the instinctive and non-rational factors deeply colour and affect the rational.

Thus, what has come to be called the New Psychology is concerned with a far wider range of

INSTINCT

elements and infinitely more complex processes in our mental life than was its parent science. It includes in its investigations the ancestral springs of self-conscious personality, and is ready to find explanations of what might seem distinctively human facts in tendencies that come down from an earlier time. Of these, Instinct is the most important.

It is the first and most essential postulate for the scientific study of the mind that all our mental processes rest upon, and are inextricably bound up with, the great inherited biological instincts by which life is preserved and reproduced. They lie at the root of our whole psychic life ; all its energy derives from them, and upon them and out of them are built up all the manifold elaborations of the complex structure which is the mind of Man. They "determine the ends of all activities, and supply the driving-power by which all mental activities are sustained." The psychic life of the saint or the pure thinker no less than that of the purely "animal" man, is deeply rooted in those ancestral instincts which brought life through its æons of development to the gate of human consciousness. Our minds can no more disown these poor relations than our bodies can "cut" the liver or the lungs. And just as, often, a weakness in brain or eye may be due to a failure in some less noble organ, so diseases and "abnormalities" which make themselves felt in the sphere of conscious reason may be traced as often as not to their roots in instinct. It is this discovery or recognition which has revolutionized "mental treatment" and founded the triumphs of modern psycho-therapy. The psychology with which we are here concerned moves from

CHRISTIANITY AND PSYCHOLOGY

first to last within the circle of which this postulate is the diameter.

This, then, is the starting-point of our whole discussion, and it may require some mental readjustment before we are quite ready to accept it. We shall have to be prepared, if necessary, to revise our attitude towards our instincts. We tend to think and speak extremely vaguely about instinct in the animals, as though it were, by contrast with reason, some inexplicable faculty implanted in their breasts by the Creator, but in no way shared by Man. "Animals have instinct, Man has reason" is the popular way of stating it. Or, if we recognize the presence of instinct in civilized human life at all, we tend to regard it as something impolite, something which is the enemy of "spirit," not to be recognized in religious circles. We refer with a blush of shame to "our animal instincts" (by which, in fact, we commonly mean sex) and assume that we must outgrow them and live them down. But the whole burden of modern psychology is that this is utterly impossible, even if it were admitted to be desirable. There is no activity of human life which does not get its driving-power from instinct, and no thought, emotion or desire, however pure and however highly spiritualized, which has not instinct at the root of it. This is the first fact with which we must come to terms.

It is also true, as we shall see later, that with the development of intelligence, instincts may be disguised and modified, fused and combined with one another, till they acquire almost a different significance from that which they had for the earlier forms of life. For intelligence can conceive ideal aims, and

INSTINCT

so set in motion the instinctive impulses in directions which are not really native to them. The pugnacious instinct fused with that of the herd may make a man an excellent Bridge partner. Thus it appears that there is a tendency amongst certain of the best-known psychologists, especially those who write about sociology, to exaggerate the purely biological interpretation of the most commonplace human thoughts and acts. This is no doubt an inevitable tendency in great pioneer researches. But, while this tendency may be borne in mind, we have still to recognize definitely and surely that however much refined or modified, to whatever extent weakened in significance, instincts are operative all along the line.

But, if we are to start from this assumption, we must try to reach some more exact conception of the view which modern psychology takes of instinct. It is not a mysterious substitute for knowledge, as we tend to suggest when we say of our fox-terrier that he knows or does such and such a thing "by instinct," whereas his master would have to think about it. Still less is it possible to understand it as a highly elaborate form of intelligence, achieving by some sort of intuition a long and complicated course of reasoning. On the other hand, a purely mechanical view, as though instinct was always really "blind," and instinctive actions those of conscious automata, fails to do full justice to the facts. In particular, it seems to make impossible the subsequent development of intelligence, which is "born within the sphere of instinct,"¹ and comes increasingly to impregnate and guide it.

¹ Hobhouse, *Mind in Evolution* (1901), p. 77.

CHRISTIANITY AND PSYCHOLOGY

Instinct is probably best understood as an extension or development of what is commonly called "reflex-action," containing from the first a "mental" element, which yet falls short of what we can call intelligence. From the first, we can distinguish in it the three characteristic elements of all developed mental processes—knowing, feeling and acting. When a man's "instinct of self-preservation" impels him to run away from danger, we can clearly analyse these three elements. He perceives the dangerous object : he experiences the feelings or emotions which are stirred in him by the presence of danger : and the two result in the activity (or, as it is technically called, "conation") which sends him running down the road. Thus, whereas reflex-action appears to be a purely physical process—a certain stimulus to the retina causing at once the closing of the eyelid—instinct appears to have in it from the first some element of thought, feeling and purpose.¹ So that while instinct is properly regarded as the response of inherited structure when the appropriate stimulus presents itself—that is what many psychologists call "behaviour"—there is something more, which cannot be fully explained in terms of the discharge of nervous reflexes.

On the one hand, instinctive action is not unerring. There is, for example, a type of beetle of which the larva attaches itself to a bee which has afterwards to provide for it. *But the larva does not know the bee.* "They seem to attach themselves to any hairy object that may come near them. . . . They attach

¹ Of course, "purpose" need not necessarily be *conscious* purpose as we understand it.

INSTINCT

themselves with equal readiness to any other hairy insect, and it is probable that very large numbers perish in consequence of attaching themselves to the wrong insects.”¹ Thus, instinct is seen to be not infallible; that is, it admits of development and perfection, and so is capable of modification. Lambs, for example, will often try to suck a tuft of wool on the ewe’s neck, or anything except the proper object, until at length they find the udder, to which they are attracted by smell. This shows that there is not merely a reflex-action by which the presence of a given stimulus inevitably produces the result. There is the possibility of error, and therefore of trial and “education” at least in a rudimentary form. Yet it is simply a perceived stimulus, the contact with the hairs, for example, which sets the train of instinctive action working.

On the other hand, many instinctive actions comprise an elaborate sequence of related “reactions.” If we take, for example, the hen’s care for her chickens, each particular act in the whole performance—her call, her lifting of her wings, etc.—might conceivably be called a reflex. It might be a purely reflex-action that she clucks when a certain stimulus reaches her eye, or lifts her wings when she sees the chickens coming. But how are we to account for the combination (or “integration”) of all these reactions into one complex and consistent piece of behaviour? Or why is it that a hen gets “broody” and goes through all the performance of hatching eggs, even

¹ Quoted in Hobhouse, *op. cit.*, p. 49. The reader is advised to work through Chap. IV. of this book, with its fascinating examples of animal behaviour.

CHRISTIANITY AND PSYCHOLOGY

though she has no eggs to sit on ? "There seems to be at least some permanent state corresponding to what we call . . . the parental instinct which dominates the hen's actions throughout, and without which the various reflexes would not be discharged by their appropriate stimuli."¹

These very elementary examples will help us to understand without perplexity the definition with which we shall work here. Dr McDougall's *Introduction to Social Psychology* is the pioneer work for all this branch of the subject, and the first book that should be read by anybody wishing to start the study of modern psychology. His definition of instinct is as follows :

"We may define instinct as an inherited or innate psycho-physical disposition which determines its possessor to perceive and pay attention to objects of a certain class, to experience an emotional excitement of a certain quality upon perceiving such an object, and to act in regard to it in a particular manner, or at least to experience an impulse to such action."²

A more exact discussion of the matter will be found in the books from which I have quoted. What has been said is enough for our present purposes. It will be noticed, then, that the distinctive factors in this immense, determining force called instinct are *attention*, *an emotional experience*, and *an impulse* to a specific train of action.

¹ Hobhouse, *op. cit.*, p. 53.

² P. 29 (I quote from the Fourteenth Edition throughout).

INSTINCT

Dr McDougall has drawn up a list of twelve primary "simple instincts" which underlie the whole field of our psychic life. How far his analysis may rightly be regarded as exhaustive (a matter on which the experts are not agreed) I am not qualified to discuss. Nor does it greatly matter for our purposes, and not all of them will concern us equally. From his list we may select the following :

| | |
|-----------------|--------------------|
| Self-assertion. | Sex. |
| Curiosity. | Gregariousness. |
| Pugnacity. | Parental Instinct. |
| Flight. | Feeding. |

To these we should probably add Sleep.¹ It will be seen that these are chiefly concerned with the preservation of life, its reproduction, and social environment, or (as they say) the herd.

These instincts remain constant throughout history. It is impossible to eradicate them. Each of them is charged with a specific emotional quality or "affect," which supplies it with its driving-force. All the energy we have is connected with these inherited instincts, and is discharged in response to the proper stimulus. All our life-force flows along these channels. All this energy must find its outlet, and there is no other energy available.

With the development of civilization, the immediate need and opportunity for the operation of these instincts is diminished. In the animal, they function automatically. In response to the hunger-stimulus it feeds : in response to the love-stimulus, it mates. All the energy of the organism is used up naturally

¹ W. Brown, *Suggestion and Mental Analysis*, p. 33.

CHRISTIANITY AND PSYCHOLOGY

in these responses. When Man appears he brings a problem with him.

Not all his instincts can find their normal outlet. The sheer necessities of hunger, fear, etc., are mitigated by the conveniences of ordered life. And the pressure of society and of whatever moral code he recognizes tends to suppress the activity of those instincts which have an anti-social tendency—the egotistic and pugnacious impulses. The social instinct, indeed (as Trotter shows), colours the whole of the psychic life of man : but one of its most obvious results is to come into violent collision with sex, self-seeking and pugnacity. Psychologists writing for the general public seem to me to lay excessive emphasis on the problem of the sexual instinct, often leaving the reader with the impression that psychology is wholly concerned with sex, and that human life should be studied in terms of it. This is absurd : the sexual instinct is not more fundamental than any other. Yet it is the instinct which is most curtailed by the operation of social morality, and thus inevitably figures large in the discords and crises of individual lives.

These instincts tend to conflict with one another, complete satisfaction of any one in the normal and direct fashion being often incompatible with the urgent demands of any or all of the others. Thus some seem denied any real expression at all, or any that is strong enough to satisfy them and draw off their tremendous emotional "high-potential." Hence arise the infinite possibilities of the perversion or abuse of instinct in what are called the vices of civilization. It will be seen, then, that we are

INSTINCT

here approaching the ground-plan of what should be developed into a psychology of sin. Instinct in itself is, of course, not sinful. It is ridiculous to speak of instincts as though they were what religion calls "temptations." If hunger and love are sinful impulses, then self-destruction must be the will of God, and God be conceived as the Grand Nihilist. But they do supply the raw material out of which temptations are fashioned, and sin consists very largely in their abuse.¹ An animal cannot "lust": a man can. Because a man, by his special mental powers, is able to conceive ideal aims, to set before himself consciously as the end of action some course of satisfaction for its own sake. It is the doubtful privilege of reason to be able to misuse its non-rational relatives. If we trace things back to the start, we shall probably find that practically all the moral problems which we have to face, in ourselves or in other people, have one of the primary instincts at their root. That is why, for our immediate purpose, the study of instinct is so necessary.

The way in which instinct baffled becomes temptation is described by St Paul in a piece of piercing self-analysis to which we shall have to refer more than once:

"I had not known sin apart from the law: for I had not known lust unless the law had said 'Thou shalt not lust': but sin, finding occasion, wrought in me through the commandment all manner of lust: for apart from the law, sin is dead."²

¹ The most useful book on sin from the biological point of view is probably Dr Tennant's *Origin of Sin*. (Cambridge Univ. Press.)

² Rom. vii. 7 (R.V. marg.).

CHRISTIANITY AND PSYCHOLOGY

How are we to deal with these violent forces?

To destroy them is impossible: and we can do nothing more disastrous, whether morally or physically, than to tell people they must root them out. We must deal with them in some other way.

The force of instinct is imperious, and an outlet for its energy must be found. Any attempt to drive it underground can only issue in disaster, in an imperilling of our moral life, and sometimes even of our sanity. Psychological experts are agreed that a very large proportion of nervous and mental disorders are due to such repression of an instinct—denying it its outlet and satisfaction. Hence spring all kinds of horrible “perversions” and many diseases that destroy the soul. Balked of its outlet, instinct rages in us like a furious and destructive beast, often making havoc of our lives. Psychology here re-echoes Our Lord’s teaching. Drive an instinct out, and it comes back with seven other devils more wicked than itself, and the last state of the man is worse than the first. Thus it appears that we cannot literally “let the ape and tiger die.” The tiger is not so easily killed as that: nor can he merely be caged behind iron bars—there are no bars strong enough to hold him. Psychology here agrees with Religion—that the only practical course is to “convert” him.

We have said that these instinctive impulses cannot be eradicated. But they can to such an extent be modified by experience and training that it may be even difficult to recognize them. We saw above that instinctive actions may be more, or less, enlightened by intelligence. Intelligence may

INSTINCT

gradually begin to apprehend successive stages in the complex process until in the end, when we reach the human level, it is able to understand the ultimate aim—*i.e.* “to grasp the final purpose and meaning of conduct. . . . As this development proceeds, the need for detailed determination of response by heredity disappears.”¹ As we assume intelligent control of our native processes, we can redirect them. Thus the impulse-issuing-in-action can be trained to respond to a different or “higher” stimulus than that which originally calls it forth. Similarly, the action in which it issues can be modified in a “higher” direction, so that the instinct finds its outlet in increasingly ideal satisfaction. Such instincts as in themselves are anti-social can be trained to social ends, and a moral or religious expression can take the place of one that is merely physical.² Thus instincts cannot be changed or rooted out: but they can be converted or sublimated; and their energy can be transferred along other instinctive channels. For example, it is often seen how a balked parental instinct transfers itself to acquisitiveness: the childless man becomes a miser. The hunting instinct finds its outlet in collecting postage-stamps. These facts are commonplace, and they show how we are to set to work. Dr Hadfield points out the extent to which the various instincts, conflicting with one another and with society, tend to become self-destructive. A man only attains his full power and freedom when they are functioning in a social direction.³ For example, the self-

¹ Hobhouse, *op. cit.*, p. 77.

² In *The Spirit*, p. 94.

² McDougall, Chap. VII.

CHRISTIANITY AND PSYCHOLOGY

assertive instinct can be trained to become social, the man identifying himself with a cause or a lover or a country, so that his self instinct works altruistically. It is needless to multiply examples. Anybody can think of half a hundred. But this gives us the key to what the psychologists teach about the sublimation of our instincts. Thus, when the force of some instinctive impulse cannot (for any reason, moral or physical) be used in the ordinary biological way, its energies may and must be transferred. This transference of instinctive energies will be found to be one of the prime facts in our moral and religious life.

So far as religion concerns moral action, we shall find that its solution consists largely in offering us right lines for "sublimation." But this, and the broader question of the attitude of Christianity to the inherited instincts, we must leave for discussion in a later lecture.

CHAPTER II.

THE UNCONSCIOUS.

WE have seen already that some of the prime springs of our moral and intellectual lives lie very deep down in our nature below the levels of everyday thought and act. We have now to see that in fact the greater part of our ordinary everyday lives, even those acts which we most take for granted, are to a very great extent determined by causes of which we are often quite unaware. The discovery of the Unconscious, which marks, on the whole, the most important advance of the new psychology upon the old, and has had such revolutionary effects, especially in the psychology of Religion, is chiefly connected with F. W. H. Myers.¹ It was he who first began scientifically to explore and map out that uncharted country to whose existence somehow, in some form, all human experience bears witness. In great moments of mystic exaltation the soul takes wings and visits some far land, which, when she sees it, she knows to be her home. Prophet and poet, seer and lover, all testify to this experience : “We feel that we are greater than we know.” But there are also continual invasions—savage and friendly, mystical or beastly—

¹ William James in *Varieties*, p. 233, dates the recognition of the “subliminal” 1886. Myers’ book, *Human Personality and the Survival of Bodily Death* was first published in 1902. There is now a one-volume edition of it in cheap form.

CHRISTIANITY AND PSYCHOLOGY

crossing the frontier and entering into our mind, often rudely disturbing the inhabitants. Myers set himself to chart out this region from which, or through which, enter into us impulses, desires and imaginations, so diverse in kind and moral quality—the inspiration of the seer and the fierce obsession of the lunatic, the intuition of the genius, the prophet's vision and the sensualist's dream—and found it to be a part of our own selves lying outside waking consciousness.¹ Indeed the thoughts of our waking consciousness, with which the older writers on psychology were exclusively concerned, are but a very little part of us. The field of consciousness at any moment is but a tiny section of ourselves. There are great reaches above, below, and around it, running out to the circumference, which are integral parts of what we call our minds, though we may not be at any given moment—or indeed, at any moment—conscious of them. This is Myers' "subliminal" self, now known generally as the "unconscious." Between it and the conscious mind there is constant interchange and interaction, with results which we must examine later on.

Since Myers' time the maps have become more detailed. The pioneer work of the "analytical psychologists" (led by Freud at Vienna and Jung at Zürich) has enabled us to know far more accurately the nature of this mysterious land, and something about the laws which govern it. Terminology has become more accurate. This idea of an "unconscious," which seems at first sight so ridiculous,

¹ On the "subliminal" see Myers, Chaps. II. and III.; Pratt, *Religious Consciousness*, Chap. III.; James, *Varieties*, Chaps. VIII.-X.

THE UNCONSCIOUS

is the basis of all the most fruitful modern work : and it is important for us to try and grasp not merely the fact of its existence, but at least the elements of how it works. This is the great contribution of the “new” psychology. At the same time it is necessary to realize that this fundamental postulate is still the subject of much disagreement. The two pioneer workers, Freud and Jung, represent different interpretations, and the English writers differ very widely.¹ Thus it is impossible to be dogmatic, or to enter into any technical detail. It is only right, however, to warn the reader that the matter is not anything like so simple as I shall try in this lecture to make it appear. We shall leave out everything that is not essential.

The Unconscious, as the term is used by Freud, and as most of the current popular statements of the new psychology seem to understand it, refers to something which is secondary, and, in a sense, highly sophisticated. Freud means by it certain parts of consciousness which are “repressed” and barred out from consciousness, because for some reason in our personal history they are painful to us or regarded as illegitimate. Certainly there are such elements, and we shall have to discuss them in a moment. (See pp. 35 *sq.*) But this is not the whole of the Unconscious. The current idea that what lies below the threshold is something which we ought not to talk about, is due, no doubt, to a crude familiarity with the Freudian conception to the exclusion of all other elements. In what follows we shall mean by the

¹ I follow Tansley, *The New Psychology*, Chap. IV. and Hart, *Psychology of Insanity*, Chap. V.

CHRISTIANITY AND PSYCHOLOGY

Unconscious all those regions of the mind of which we are not, at a given moment, conscious. Of these some, like normal memories, enter into consciousness when we require them. Others, as Freud insists, have been "repressed," and can only enter consciousness indirectly and by subterfuges. While it is probable that there are tracts which have never yet been—and possibly cannot be—fully explored by the lamp of conscious reason.¹

We can start from a perfectly familiar fact of our commonest experience. If we examine the stream of our own thoughts, we shall find they are constantly being interrupted. Sudden "inspirations" come to us: ideas, images and thoughts flash into the mind, quite unexpectedly and inexplicably, breaking the flow of our connected thinking.² "Wandering thoughts" are well known to us all. These ideas have no recognizable cause in the ideas that preceded them, and so (being conscious of some disconnection) we tend to say that they are *accidental*: they come into our minds, we say, "from nowhere."

But nothing happens without a cause: and if the cause cannot be found in the ideas that have preceded them, we must look for a sufficient cause elsewhere. This very simple but very important fact was what first led to the hypothesis that there must be activities or functions of the mind, having their effects in consciousness, of which we are not ourselves directly conscious. Memory is another fact of the kind. Here there are stored-up thoughts and experiences lying "somewhere" in our minds, which

¹ There is an illustrative diagram in Tansley, p. 44.

² Tansley, Chap. IV.

THE UNCONSCIOUS

at the touch of a certain stimulus find themselves back in our waking minds again. The most fascinating groups of facts calling for some such notion to explain them are obviously those which are supplied by reflecting on the mysterious world of dreams.¹ Again, it is not otherwise with our actions. Often an impulse suddenly enters the mind, and before we know where we are, we commit an action of which, looking back, we say, quite truthfully, "I really don't know why I behaved like that." But there was a cause, and the cause is to be sought in the operations of the Unconscious.

In all these cases, the machinery which has been at work has been the same. It is what used to be called in the older books, the "association of ideas." We must picture the contents of our minds not as a number of isolated thoughts, but as systems of thought in certain combinations.² Some writers prefer to state the matter differently. The mind, they consider, retains not its ideas so much as the condition of their revival; that is, it is like a record for the gramophone—not in itself the actual music, but a condition of its reproduction. But even so, they are grouped in a certain scheme, and function, when revived, in association. The record plays the tune which it has recorded.

Now, most of these networks of associations are grouped in some form, direct or indirect, round one or other of the great primary instincts, and each is charged with a certain emotional quality, stronger

¹ See below, p. 39, with references.

² For the physiological processes in Association, see James, *Text-book of Psychology*, Chap. XVI.

CHRISTIANITY AND PSYCHOLOGY

or weaker, as the case may be. Not all of these associated systems (which are what psychology calls "complexes")¹ are active in the mind at any moment. Normally we are conscious in the morning of all the ideas and emotions which centre round our work, in the afternoon, possibly our recreation, and in the evening some other set of interests.

The mention of the office or the study tends to call the first into consciousness : but all the others are there below the surface, and when the appropriate stimulus occurs, they become active in the field of thought, drawing into their association all other systems and images and interests which are capable of being connected with them, and with a tendency to drive out the others. For example, how little provocation is needed to make an enthusiastic golfer drown the conversation by talking "golf-shop." The more devoted to the game he is, the more he sees everything in terms of golf. Golf tends to control his thoughts and actions. In the office, when his work is occupying the field of his conscious thought, he sees from the window the tram that runs to the links. The golf associations are called in. Away fly work and business from his mind, and the golf system holds the field. This is the process which is at work in memory, and in all the other cases we have examined. In that ordinary

¹ Many psychologists use the word "complex" to denote only morbid, unhealthy or pathological associations. I use it here and all through in the extended sense given by Hart, and Tansley who follows his usage. In this book, technicalities are so far as possible avoided, because nearly every writer uses the technical terms in a different sense. This is what makes the subject so difficult and complicated at present.

THE UNCONSCIOUS

memory on which any ordered mind depends, the process has become automatic. It needs no effort when we see a tree, to connect it with other trees which we have seen. When we have food upon our forks, we do not have to think what the next step is: association functions automatically.

Here are examples of association which do in fact control our thoughts and actions, though we are not conscious that they are being made. This process extends throughout our mental life. When we act, as we say, without knowing why, it is just the same thing which is happening. Something stimulates an association of emotions and ideas below the surface, and they at once become active in consciousness, supplying the motive, as we say, for action. Here is the clue to the "unconscious motive." We have seen that any system of interests, when it is actively functioning in the mind, tends to banish others. The golfer tends to see bunkers in running brooks and golf in everything. The artist looking at a landscape, sees it in terms of his own art: the soldier tells you that it is "fine country for fighting—what?"

Now, in these cases, the man is probably aware of the associations that operate in his mind. The soldier will say, "Yes, fighting is my profession, and because I'm interested in my profession it is that aspect of the country that appeals to me." Even here, we shall not fail to notice how easily a "bias" gets into the mind: our dominant interests always affect our thinking. But we can go further. There are other cases in which a man's thoughts and acts

CHRISTIANITY AND PSYCHOLOGY

are determined by causes of which he is not at all aware, and of which he would much prefer to remain ignorant. During the Tariff Reform controversy there were many enthusiastic Unionists or personal admirers of Joseph Chamberlain, who accepted with avidity all the arguments telling for Tariff Reform. The bent of their minds in this particular direction led them to banish or rule out all anti-Chamberlain ideas which were incompatible with this dominant complex. They simply could not see the force of the Free Trade arguments : they were so obviously unconvincing !

These enthusiasts argued hotly for Tariff Reform, producing a long string of arguments, convinced that they were taking a perfectly logical line. But, in fact, they were doing nothing of the kind. Their thinking on the subject was determined, not by logic, but by the strength of the Chamberlain associations, that is, really by quite non-rational causes. The psychology of the party politician, which is a commonplace of the text-books, supplies a very obvious example of the way in which our intellectual processes are controlled by causes of which we are not aware, and which are very often the reverse of rational. Yet, as we hate to think (if we are Englishmen) that we are acting otherwise than rationally, we invent for ourselves a string of reasons for the line of thought we adopt, or the act we do, honestly thinking that they are the causes, whereas, in fact, they are nothing of the sort. Little of our thought is strictly logical, and few of the reasons we give are the real causes which determine either our actions or our thoughts. As Dr Inge

THE UNCONSCIOUS

laconically puts it: "Individuals sometimes act rationally, crowds never."

The process which we have been investigating, which is technically called "rationalization," is very important for us in our own sphere. It enters into Religion and Theology more, perhaps, than we altogether realize. Hart gives an instance of a Sunday School teacher who suddenly became an Atheist. He read up the subject and argued weightily, demolishing all the traditional "proofs" of God. He honestly thought that these arguments were his reasons. But the real reason was, as was afterwards discovered, that he had been jilted by a lady who taught the girls in the same Sunday School. The intense force of these associations led him to welcome every argument telling against the thoughts associated with those disappointing Sunday afternoons.¹ The correspondence columns of the Church Press often supply magnificent examples in which to watch this machinery at work. The overwhelming and elaborate arguments which people produce to support some small traditionalism in ceremonial or doctrine, or (equally) some clear-eyed Modernism, are often determined by quite non-rational causes. Their hobby happens to be that special form of ecclesiology, or their social instinct draws them very closely to the particular group that holds these tenets. It is really that which decides their beliefs. Many things again, are often held to be demanded of a Christian, which are really dictated—if the truth were known—by social convention or business interests.

¹ Hart, *op. cit.*, pp. 71, 72.

CHRISTIANITY AND PSYCHOLOGY

In fact, a "wholesale acceptance of non-rational beliefs must be looked upon as normal."¹ It is obvious that this tendency of the mind is the very cement of human societies, and it is the commonplace of History that the free activity of critical reason is inevitably suspected and repressed as a dangerous solvent of social stability. The tragic story of the persecutions is more than a revelation of blind cruelty. It is dictated by the mighty instinct of self-preservation in the group. A struggling group cannot afford "heretics." But, from our present point of view, if we wish to be sincere in thought and act, we must notice the recognized force of these mass-suggestions and be unweariedly on our guard against them.

It appears, then, that if (as we have seen) our thought is so largely controlled by factors that are not really logical, it is an extraordinarily unwise proceeding to require intellectual assent to a given set of propositions as a condition of Church-membership. There is no trace that Our Lord ever did so. He made uncompromising claims: but He never asked for a "declaration of assent." We are right to make Christianity difficult, but we make it difficult in the wrong way. We confront people with the wrong kind of difficulties. And we know too much about the antecedents of intellectual beliefs to attach a very high value to formal "Orthodoxy." On the other hand, it must never be forgotten that we are endowed with reason and a will, and the main value of investigation into our unconscious processes

¹ Trotter, *Instincts of the Herd in Peace and War*, p. 36. This is a most stimulating and important book.

THE UNCONSCIOUS

is to bring these into the full daylight of reason, and under the direction of conscious will. Real "Orthodoxy" means "thinking straight." We can see then, as the other aspect of my last statement, the tremendous force of Our Lord's emphasis on intellectual sincerity and the need of the single eye and the pure heart if we are ever truly to know God. Thinking is not merely intellectual : it is a function of our whole personality. And whether we can think truly and justly, and so have the means to guide our lives aright, depends very largely on our characters, which are, at least in part, in our own control. "Whosoever wills to do the will of God, he shall know the doctrine."

It is, of course, in the case of moral action that this process of self-deception works most plainly. Very often we do not honestly know why it was that we acted as we did. But equally often we deceive ourselves. Having done an act of which we are ashamed, there is never a lack of impressive arguments to justify it to ourselves and to others. We must try to track the motive to its roots.¹

The heart of man, as all the moral teachers have affirmed with monotonous reiteration, is desperately wicked and deceitful above all things, and no advice is harder than "Know thyself." So that some slight knowledge of the actual way in which this process of self-deception operates is of infinite value in facing our own lives, and dealing with the lives of other people. Not infrequently our diagnosis, when we are faced with sins or "cases of conscience,"

¹ Cf. Pym, *Psychology and the Christian Life*, Chap. V. (on Self-examination and Psycho-analysis).

CHRISTIANITY AND PSYCHOLOGY

tends to deal with the symptoms, not the cause. We must recall the repeated emphasis which Our Lord laid in so many different forms on the reversal of our human judgments when the secrets of the heart are known to God. "There are first which shall be last, and there are last which shall be first." It is not only that no man among us is good enough to judge another ("Judge not and ye shall not be judged") : it is that so few of us *can* judge ourselves. "I know nothing against myself," said St Paul, "but I am not thereby justified ; He that judgeth me is the Lord" (1 Cor. iv. 4). It is possible, as Our Lord pointed out in one of His most devastating sayings, for even the most sincere and unselfish of us to be wholly deceived about our own motives. "Many will say to me on that day, 'Lord, have we not preached in Your Name, and in Your Name undertaken the cure of souls, and in Your Name done much powerful work ?' Then I shall declare unto them, I have never owned you, leave me, you have been doing the devil's work" (Matt. vii. 22).

The facts we have described throw light on all this. And so, if we are to preserve our integrity, we must try to penetrate relentlessly to the secret springs of action—and most humiliating the process is. "No one must expect to live in contact with the unconscious without being constantly humiliated."¹ But unless we attempt unsparingly to expose the unseen motives which actuate us, our thinking may be hopelessly perverted and our moral judgments and actions masked and blinded by a cloud which we have ourselves created. There is

¹ M. Nicoll, *Dream-psychology*, p. 187.

THE UNCONSCIOUS

what Plato calls the lie in the soul. "If the light that is within us is darkness, how great is the darkness!" It is the "mote and the beam" over again.

It is through the machinery we have been examining that there are brought about those states of discord and conflict in the mind when "the house is divided against itself" and may ultimately "be brought to desolation." Suppose a man has two powerful systems of associated ideas and emotions which are incompatible with one another, or of which one is inconsistent with the general tenor of his character or the moral ideals to which he owns allegiance. A conflict must inevitably arise. One may centre round the service of his fellows (the social instinct is at the root of it) and the other round his personal ambition (with the self-assertive instinct as its driving-power). The two systems are incompatible. Hence arises the familiar story of the divided life, with all its misery, its paralysis and loss of power. But nobody can live always in this state. "It is a biological necessity that some way out of the impasse should be found."¹ For nobody, in the end, can serve two masters. The ideal way, which most of us pursue in the ordinary decisions of our life, is to face the discord and make our deliberate choice. So Our Lord was always forcing people to face up to their conflicts and make their choice. You cannot set hands to the plough and then look back; you cannot be a Mr Facing-Both-Ways, if your life is to be a life of power and happiness.

But such decisions are often painful: they may mean cutting off the hand and plucking out the eye.

¹ Hart, p. 79.

CHRISTIANITY AND PSYCHOLOGY

And the mind has many ways of avoiding this. One way is the method of water-tight compartments. We allow both systems to function side by side, never allowing them to meet, and so conceal from ourselves their opposition. That is, we continue to lead what other people, looking on, call "inconsistent lives." The system which centres round our business interests (with the acquisitive instinct at its root) may be obviously inconsistent with that which centres round our religious beliefs. We avoid the collision by holding them apart, living in a real sense "double lives," keeping each system wholly opaque to the other. Anyone can think of a dozen instances of what we should all (in the case of other people) call, without further ado, "hypocrisy." But to call it names does not solve the problem. And the problem for Religion is just that—so to unify our lives, that all the different systems of thought and feeling, each with their own particular standard of conduct, are co-ordinated round the service of God. Most of us are still frankly polytheists. We acknowledge three or four conflicting principles in the conduct of our lives. But the Lord our God, as the Master said, is *one* Lord; and we have to learn to love Him with *all* our hearts, and *all* our minds and souls and strength. If that is ever achieved in any of us, then we shall have been genuinely "converted." (We shall deal with this in Chapter IV. below.)

The extreme cases of this attempted solution run up into the region of insanity—the familiar stories of "disintegrated personality" (technically called "Dissociation") where the patient literally lives

THE UNCONSCIOUS

two lives, living now in one and now in the other without any conscious relation between the two. A patient thinks he is a poached egg, and at the same time spends his days weeding the garden-path in the asylum. The classic case, of course, is Jekyll and Hyde. Ansell Bourne and Sally Beauchamp are the stock examples of the text-books, and many astounding instances are quoted in the appendices to Myers' book.

We are also here, I think, treading on the threshold of that dim world of divided souls which the New Testament calls demoniac possession, where one of the dissociated selves takes the guise of a frightful outside force, driving the sufferer along to misery. As an instance, the man who said his name was "Division," so many hosts were driving him along (Mark v. 9).

Where the inconsistency between the two systems is acutely realized by the mind, an escape is sought by a very elaborate process of rationalization to avoid the conflict. The mind will invent and act out an elaborate pose, moving in a perpetual delusion. Nowhere are these delusions more easily manufactured, and nowhere have we to be more ware of them, than in the sphere of our religious life. Let us take a trivial example, which will serve to suggest others of a more far-reaching kind. A Christian who is temperamentally self-indulgent may persuade himself that he overeats himself "to keep up his strength for the service of the Church," or because his luxury is "good for trade." We often meet more furious delusions, far more calamitous in their results, which are manufactured in this manner.

CHRISTIANITY AND PSYCHOLOGY

And here, too, we have the origin of many of those fierce obsessions common in the records of insanity.

The alternative way out is the method of repression. If there is incompatibility, we try to drive one of the systems underground, repress it, or inhibit it from action. A mild and interesting form of this is seen in familiar cases of lost memory. *Why* do we forget the name of that place or person at the critical moment? Often it is for reasons of that kind. The name is connected with an association which is painful to remember—perhaps because we are ashamed of it—and we try, therefore, to keep it in the cellar. That place-name that so absurdly escapes our memory is connected with unpleasant associations; we had a quarrel with our friend there, or we got there hungry and the lunch was nasty: and so the mechanism of our minds takes steps to prevent the memory from reviving.¹

This is frequently the means adopted to deal with affections or interests which, for any reason, we cannot satisfy. We try to drive them out of our conscious minds: and we do, but they do not therefore cease to function. They find their outlet indirectly, often by means of elaborate symbolism. Many of our dreams, but by no means all, are possibly explicable along these lines. A wish that we have not been able to satisfy, and have sought to banish from our minds, regains its entrance under the disguise of the elaborate dream-symbolism, or by means of ungovernable impulses. That is why the analysis of dreams is considered so important

¹ On all this, see Freud, *Psycho-pathology in Everyday Life* (E.T.), Chap. III.

THE UNCONSCIOUS

by those who seek to cure a mind diseased by probing its secret hopes and fears and conflicts, which is the business of psycho-analysis.

This is the famous Freudian theory of dream-interpretation. According to it every dream is an unfulfilled wish (very frequently a baffled wish)—and for Freud every wish is sexual—expressing itself in our consciousness through the disguise of a symbol and dream-image. It is possible that this is largely true. But certainly not all dreams can be so interpreted. Some, according to a larger theory, are foreshadowings of future actions—the life-force, pushing out in a new direction,¹ first presenting itself in symbolical guise. If this be so, then the old-world theory that dreams are prophetic is not devoid of truth, and Joseph and the old prognosticators might still appear in respectable society.

But to return, this process of repression is both mentally and morally charged with the gravest dangers. Nearly all the nervous and mental ills with which psychological medicine has to deal, are traceable to it in one form or another. We shall see it, too, in demoniac possession when we come to examine that mysterious subject and seek to discover the thought of Our Lord about it.

Let us remember what was said above, that practically all these systems have one of the great instincts at their root. Thus all these cases of conflict and repression are concerned in the end with the function and regulation of one or other of our

¹ M. Nicoll, *op. cit.*, works on Jung's theory as contrasted with that of Freud. W. H. Rivers' *Conflict and Dream* (Kegan Paul) was not published in time for me to make use of it.

CHRISTIANITY AND PSYCHOLOGY

inherited instincts—sex (more often than we care to think) and still more frequently the gregarious impulse, which is perhaps, when all is said and done, the dominant force in the lives of all of us.

Thus the problem for the mind-practitioner, and the problem for Religion, is the harmonizing of conflicting systems and the regulation of instinctive impulses, so as to give power and freedom and the fullest possible self-expression to the life of the individual. The answer of Christianity to this will occupy us in a later lecture.

CHAPTER III.

SUGGESTION AND WILL.

THE mapping out of the Unconscious is so highly controversial, and raises such fascinating speculations, that one is tempted to deal with it at length. It is best, however, to leave it to the experts, referring the reader to the books mentioned, and contenting ourselves here with the barest skeleton, enough to make intelligible what follows, and to show at least what the main problems are. We must now pass to a closely connected subject—the laws and machinery of Suggestion, the investigation of which is certainly bringing us to the gateway of a new world of power and knowledge. In this section I shall mainly follow Baudouin's book *Suggestion and Auto-suggestion*, “the most exciting book since *The Origin of Species*,” as an early review described it. It needs to be read, I think, extremely critically, and I shall sometimes make bold to criticize it. But it must be remembered that the book is not concerned, by the scope of its own plan, with religious or philosophical questions. It is in the main a medical text-book—an account of clinical practice in Psycho-therapy in the New Nancy School under Coué. It is, therefore, not altogether reasonable to expect from it a satisfactory treatment of pro-

CHRISTIANITY AND PSYCHOLOGY

blems in ethics or metaphysics, though these inevitably confront the reader.

We have noticed already something of the extent to which unconscious processes influence—some would say definitely control—our lives. It is then, obviously enough, a matter of quite paramount importance, if we are to be masters of ourselves, that we should know how to control these mighty forces, and use for the highest purposes of life the immense energy that is locked up in them. For this, as was suggested at the beginning, is the line of all genuine advance and progress. We can harness the stream of the unconscious and turn its crude force into effective “power” by the use of what has come to be called Suggestion.

Here, at the outset, we must empty our minds of a popular, but quite unfounded notion, that Suggestion is the equivalent of delusion. In our ordinary language, if we say of an idea or belief that it is “merely auto-suggestion,” we commonly mean that there is “nothing in it,” that it is the invention of a deluded mind. Now, of course, it is true that no mental process is, or can ever be, entirely fool-proof. There is always the possibility of error. A man may be sure that he positively *knows* something which, in fact, is not true. There are other facts which he has not considered, or some unnoticed flaw in his reasoning, or some unconscious bias in his mind, so that the knowledge he claims is not really knowledge. However difficult it may be found as a matter of pure philosophical speculation to give an intelligent account of it, we all recognize that error is possible. But, nevertheless, the whole fact of know-

SUGGESTION AND WILL

ledge (in so far as it really is knowledge) is of knowing something which is "there" to be known quite independently of our knowing it. If our minds change or affect a thing in the process of perceiving it, then what happens is something else, not knowledge. We make it, or alter it, or what you will : we certainly do not know it as it is. If we suppose that our minds create their objects in the act that we call knowing them, no less than if—as modern theories tend with increasing emphasis to suggest—we create the moral values by which we live, we reduce the world to an utter, hopeless chaos. For all truth and all right action involve the correspondence of our mind with facts and values and relations which are part of the constitution of Reality. The way of stating this in popular speech is to say that knowledge is "objective."

It is highly important for us to realize that, whatever else we may say about it later, and whatever the possibilities of error—*suggestion is as "objective" as knowledge.*

In the absolutely literal sense auto-suggestion is impossible.¹ You can only suggest what is "there" to be suggested. So that suggestion, as a mental instrument, can no more than knowledge alter things : it can only alter our attitude to things. It cannot make something out of nothing : it cannot make a lie out of truth : it cannot change a bad thing into a good thing. But it can give us power to overcome the evil, and to accept and act upon the truth.

¹ See Rouse and Crichton Miller, *Christian Experience and Psychological Processes* (S.C.M.), pp. 102-104.

CHRISTIANITY AND PSYCHOLOGY

Another mistake, which perhaps we need hardly combat, is to confuse the process called Suggestion with the melodramatic idea of Hypnotism, as though in our weakness and dependence we surrendered ourselves, our wills, and destinies, into the power of some sinister, stronger will. This is ridiculous, as anybody who reads Baudouin's book will see at once. Psycho-therapists at the present time seem to employ Hypnotism very little: and even then the whole point of suggestion is *not* to impose our wishes and ideas on the will of a reluctant victim, but rather the opposite—to help the patient to accept for himself a beneficial idea, to make it his own and translate it into action.

This is what leads Baudouin to remark that auto-suggestion is the true type of all suggestion. What he means is this. There are two possibilities. You can make a suggestion to yourself, or some other person can make it to you. The former process is Auto- or Self-suggestion, the latter, Hetero- or Other-suggestion. But, even in the second of these processes, the suggestion cannot become effective until it has been *accepted* by the patient, made his own and worked into his own life. Then it becomes in a true sense Self-suggestion. It goes without saying, of course, that a feeling of confidence, trust and affection for him who makes the suggestion, plays a large part in enabling the patient to accept the idea from him and make it his own. We can see, then, already that the tremendous emphasis which Religion has always thrown on Trust and Faith, is not without its psychological basis. That we shall have to discuss more fully soon. Meanwhile it is time

SUGGESTION AND WILL

we came to grips more closely with a statement of what Suggestion really is.

It is one of the commonest facts of our experience that a problem which has baffled us overnight is found solved when we wake up in the morning. We commonly say that it has "solved itself," so little aware are we of our share in it. Strictly speaking, we are talking nonsense. It is obviously our mind which has solved it, but it has done so without our knowing it. In other words we can here catch sight of the secret, on which the whole idea of Suggestion rests, of Nature's favourite labour-saving device. Our "Unconscious" has solved the problem while our conscious minds were at rest in sleep.¹ Our tired brains have handed the problem over to the unconscious, which has done the work for them. Suggestion means, in effect, the deliberate use of the machinery which is here disclosed. Thus the simplest of the definitions which Baudouin gives is nothing more than this : *the subconscious realization of an idea.*²

The process admits of very wide extension. It is not confined to intellectual tasks, like the solving of a mathematical problem. It is also operative in the sphere of action, in conduct and in our vital processes. An idea that is once accepted by the unconscious tends without conscious effort on our part to realize itself in action. Anybody can satisfy himself by a number of elementary experiments that there is this power in the un-

¹ The common phrase "unconscious cerebration" would appear to be a contradiction in terms.

² *Op. cit.*, p. 26.

CHRISTIANITY AND PSYCHOLOGY

conscious mind of controlling our bodies without our knowing it.¹

The real heart of the suggestion-process is this translation of idea into action, otherwise than by deliberate volition. So that Baudouin gives as a second definition, *the transformation of an idea into action*. But the idea has first to be "accepted," so that we may in fact analyse three stages; of which the first two steps are deliberate, and the third, the result, is achieved by the unconscious.

1. The presentation of the suggestion—by another, or by the patient to himself.
2. Its acceptance by the patient.
3. Its transformation into act.

Some knowledge of the working of this process seems to be nearly as old as the human race. For it is probable that many facts which have commonly been regarded as "Black Magic," or (if they are beneficent) as "Miracle," admit of explanation by this law. No doubt, a vast amount of old-world magic, the recipes for lovers' philtres, the sticking of pins into a waxen image, the turning of the wry-neck on the wheel, and all the primitive lore of "mimetic" magic which Anthropology has made familiar, rest on a childish theory of causation. Our science, in sweeping it away for ever, has freed the race from a crushing burden of terror, cruelty and superstition. But what are we to say to some forms

¹ For example, stretch out your arm at full length and suggest to yourself that it will be seized with palsied tremors. A strange twitching will at once begin and your hand will soon be shaking like a leaf. You can then stop it with another suggestion. Perhaps the best is Coué's First Experiment (see *Suggestion and Auto-Suggestion*, pp. 209-214).

SUGGESTION AND WILL

of "witchcraft"? It is, it appears, an indisputable fact that if a man believes he has been bewitched, that an evil eye has been cast upon him which is going to bring him to his death, then on the appointed day he retires to his hut, lays himself down on the ground and surely dies. Quite apart from its moral quality, or the religious attitude involved, the same machinery of the mind would seem to be in operation here as, say, in the miracles at Lourdes—or, if you prefer it, the Temple of Asklepios. Making all allowance for imposture (to which Temple-cures, whether old or new, are notoriously exposed) I do not think it possible to doubt that a good proportion of these results did, and do, occur as recorded. There does not seem to be any essential difference between them and the familiar experiment of raising a blister by suggestion, or of winning a boat-race by the same method. "They can because they believe they can"—as Virgil said about that long ago.

It seems to be the law of human life that *according to our faith it is done unto us*. Those who believe in the strength of hatred and evil are apt to find themselves their helpless victims. Those who believe in the triumphant power of love can overcome themselves and the world. So Christ declared in the Sermon on the Mount. It is this law, so terrible in its potency, so charged with illimitable possibilities, that we want to employ to advance the Kingdom of God.

It is being used with startling results in what is now called Psycho-therapy. Thus, a "shell-shock" patient who is paralysed may recover the use of his limb through suggestion-treatment. The

CHRISTIANITY AND PSYCHOLOGY

method employed by a leading practitioner is described by him somewhat as follows:¹ Suppose a man has the use of his arms quite normally, but is paralysed in his legs. The doctor may casually say to him, "You will find you cannot lift your right arm." The patient will, as a rule, when he tries to lift it, find it is held fast to his side. It will then be explained, "There is nothing the matter with your arm, it is exactly as it was yesterday, the only reason why you could not lift it was that (accepting my suggestion) you had made up your mind that you could not do so. Now, why can't you move your legs? Just for the same reason, because you *think* you cannot. But I tell you that you can." The patient then proceeds to walk normally and discovers that his paralysis has gone.

In these and similar cases, it should be noted, the disease which is thus treated is *functional* only. That is to say, that what is thus put right is something wrong, in the end, in the man's mind. It is not an organic disease in the limb concerned. The distinction between organic and functional has hitherto been regarded as fundamental, and the methods of psycho-therapy have been supposed to be only of value in the latter case. It is now, however, claimed by Baudouin that Coué's practice has made this distinction obsolete, and that any organic disease will yield to treatment by suggestion. If so, it would seem that there is literally no limit to its possibilities. But it would be dangerous for the layman, in the absence of further medical opinion, to take this conclusion as too certain. We can only

¹ Hadfield in *The Spirit*, pp. 84-86.

SUGGESTION AND WILL

remark that the claim has been made, though I think it is doubtful whether the evidence is as yet sufficient to establish it. The specialists' verdict, of course, might be different.

But, even if we should have to confine ourselves within the narrower sphere of functional cases, enormous possibilities open before us. "The deaf hear, the blind receive their sight, and the lame walk" every day by the almost magical power of this new method. And as we read the record of such cures, some of the stories and sayings in the Gospel flash irresistibly into the mind.

A man once came to Our Lord with a paralysed hand hanging helplessly by his side. He asked to be cured. Our Lord said something to him which people could only take to be sheer folly. He told him to stretch out his hand. ("You can, you know," He said to him in effect.) To everyone's astonishment, *he did*, "and it was restored whole like the other." Again, the father of a boy who was (as the story says) "possessed by a demon" came to Jesus and implored His help. "If you can do anything," he said, "have pity on us and help us." Jesus said to him, "*If you can*. Anything can be done if a man has faith" (Mark ix. 22, 23).

But it is plain that the method of suggestion is not confined to the sphere of bodily health, or even of what are called "nervous ills." Its moral aspect is of supreme importance, and we must devote a short discussion to it. We have seen that suggestion works in both directions, the negative as well as the positive. "*If you suggest to yourself that you can, you can*: if you suggest to yourself that you can't,

CHRISTIANITY AND PSYCHOLOGY

you can't." It would seem that this would take us a long way in dealing with sin, and especially sinful habits. And Baudouin goes so far as to put it thus : A man is the slave of a bad habit so long as he thinks he is, and no longer.

When we advise a man to "break" a habit, we are asking, often, an impossibility. His will has been so weakened and impaired by constant yielding to the evil impulse, that he has not sufficient strength of will to burst his chains and break through to moral freedom.¹ He pleads that such advice is entirely futile : "the harder I try, the more impossible it is." Baudouin's reply is at first sight rather startling : "It is not his will that needs re-educating : it is his imagination." This is the famous *Law of Reversed Effort*, which may be stated in the following way : *When Will and Imagination come into conflict* (or at least, let us say, when this conflict reaches a certain pitch of intensity), *Imagination always wins.*²

At this point, we must pause and find our bearings. For we seem to be losing touch with the one fact of human life about which we should claim certainty, namely, the primacy of the will. Suggestion seems at first sight to dethrone the will, putting some nebulous feeling in its place, and Baudouin certainly seems—at first reading at any rate—to relegate it to a very subordinate place in the hierarchy of the mind.

Indeed, the impression that strikes one with dismay in reading modern psychology as a whole, is that the will seems to have disappeared. If so, it reduces

¹ Cf. Kirk, *Principles of Moral Theology*, p. 257.

² *Op. cit.*, p. 125.

SUGGESTION AND WILL

human life to chaos. It is here that Baudouin and many other writers raise such acute problems in philosophy, and seem likely to lead one into a blind-alley, in which the alleged facts of psychological science come into an irreconcilable conflict with the demands of ethics and religion. For it may be roundly stated that any satisfactory conception of the nature of human personality is impossible except in terms of will. We cannot, in fact, if we are to speak exactly, say, "I have a will" at all: the truth is rather that I *am* a will. If, with Dr McDougall, for example, we reduce what we call "will" to the addition of the sentiment of positive self-feeling to another experienced desire, we seem to have dissolved the essential unity of conscious personal life altogether. We are driven back to a kind of "atomism," such as we connect with David Hume. It is one thing, and a necessary thing, to trace out the historic development by which personality comes to be; it is quite another to make an adequate statement of what personality now is.

And I cannot but hold that the strongest criticism which must be brought against Baudouin concerns the totally inadequate analysis that he has given to the idea of will which recurs so frequently in his discussion. He seems to think of will as nothing more than the inhibition of desire or the putting forth of effort. It is true, of course, that in normal experience will is developed, and manifests itself, largely in opposition to desire. But when we say "I will so-and-so," we mean in fact, that this is the aim or desire with which at the time I identify *myself*. We also mean, as we shall see later on, that in our opinion,

CHRISTIANITY AND PSYCHOLOGY

the thing can be done.¹ In other words, we mean conscious purpose. And this, to judge from the general line of his argument, is what Baudouin perhaps really means. So that when on the one hand he insists that suggestion must never be confused with will, and on the other that the way of power is to "superadd suggestion to the will," he means in effect that suggestion is a process, carried out by the unconscious, by which we can reinforce and strengthen the effective achievement of our conscious purposes. If so, the sharp distinction that he draws between will and imagination, and the clearly suggested primacy of the latter, concern a question of psychological method, not philosophical interpretation.

But, even so, I confess I do not feel satisfied. Even on the psychological level, I confess to a scepticism about his facts. We seem to need a more accurate definition. How far does he know what he really means by will?

Let us leave our philosophical position, according to which, as has been already stated, will means personality in action, not a "part" of personality. "Will," in this sense, is clearly the resultant of a long series of choices or acts of will. Let us, then, confine ourselves to the simpler issue—a more critical examination of what is really implied, psychologically, in what we commonly call "an act of will." How far is the "law of reversed effort" really in accordance with the facts?

We have seen that, according to Baudouin's treatment, suggestion only works effectively on condition

¹ William Brown, *Suggestion and Mental Analysis*, p. 127.

SUGGESTION AND WILL

of not being confused with "will power." The experiments, he says, do not prove that we have a "strong will": they prove the enormous power of the unconscious. Conscious effort implies opposition: the moment we consciously make an "effort of will," we call up at once into our minds a suggestion, or idea, of difficulty, of some force militating against success. This suggestion at once cancels out the suggested notion of success, and so stultifies the process. The only way to counter a wrong suggestion is not by will, but by counter-suggestion. Thus a man who says, "I will do my best, but I know it is going to be very difficult, and it is doubtful if I can succeed," is condemning himself to failure in advance. This is, fundamentally, the meaning of the law of Reversed Effort. But all things are possible to him that believeth. And the man who deliberately suggests to himself, "This bad habit is no longer my master: I know that holiness is stronger than evil: I am going to be able to get free of it," is going the right way to ensure success. It is in this way that suggestion "strengthens will."

That the will follows the imagination is one of the most certain facts of experience. It is also true that the training of character is largely concerned with training imagination, and herein lies some of the meaning of the prayer-life.

Now, these facts do seem to be rightly stated. But Baudouin's statement of his "law" must be held to be dangerously misleading. It is true enough that over-anxiety, any kind of strain or excessive effort, counteract the effects of suggestion. If we make a great effort of

CHRISTIANITY AND PSYCHOLOGY

trying to go to sleep, we shall most certainly get wider awake. But the conflict, in these cases which he analyses, is not really between will and something that is not will but imagination : it is between one suggestion and another. The suggestion of sleep is counteracted by the suggestion that one is going to fail ; and the will is not defeated by imagination, but is rather already nullified by being bound up with a suggestion of failure. The effort of will is “a special kind of will, a rather weak, fitful form of will, because it carries with it fear of failure. [But] the complete form of will is never in conflict with suggestion. This will works, not through an effort of determination, but with a calm assumption that, of course, it is going to succeed.”¹

This amounts to saying that, as we had suspected, Baudouin is merely handling will with a dictionary-definition. He has not analysed what it really implies. He is leaving out the intellectual factor which is an essential part of real Volition. Professor Stout’s definition makes this clear : “Volition is a desire qualified and refined by the judgment that so far as in us lies, we shall bring about the desired end because we desire it.”² That is, there is bound up with it the judgment that we *can do* what we will to do. If we think we cannot, we do not really *will* it. We may wish or desire it, but it is not willed. Aristotle, as Dr Brown reminds us in the passage from which I have already quoted, discussed this point with the utmost clearness. Will, he said, implies two factors—the intellectual

¹ W. Brown, *op. cit.*, pp. 110-113.

² *Manual of Psychology*, p. 711.

SUGGESTION AND WILL

and the appetitive. And we only *will* what we believe to be in our own power. "We cannot will what is impossible, and anyone who said he willed things like that would be thought a fool. We can *wish* for things that are impossible, immortality, for instance. We can also *wish* for things which could never be brought about by our own agency—e.g. that a certain athlete may win his race. But nobody *wills* things of this kind—only things which he believes he can himself achieve. In a word, will appears to be concerned with things which are in our own power."¹

Accepting this, we shall move to the conclusion that it is very far from being the case that "imagination" wins the victory. It would be very much nearer the truth to say that what wins the victory is completed/ will—will which includes the belief that it is in our power. It is in this way that the faith-suggestion is rightly described as "reinforcing" will. For without it, will lacks an essential factor.

This discussion has carried us a little further. But something is still conspicuously lacking. We have tried to give a more exact meaning to the word "will" than Baudouin allows it. But the thing itself is less simple than it sounds. It cannot be so easily taken for granted. It is easy to understand that ideally, as a matter of philosophical principle, "will" really means the self in action, all our faculties freely co-operating to attain a deliberately chosen end. From this point of view we should all of us admit, what we have to assume as a rough-and-ready standard, that a man's acts reveal his essential

¹ Aristotle, *Ethics*, VI. ii. 2; III. ii. 7-9.

CHRISTIANITY AND PSYCHOLOGY

character. His acts are his "character" in action. But we all know that in the world of actual fact this simple formula does not stand the test. The New Psychology, by its researches into all that is meant by the "unconscious motive," compels us to qualify our statement even as a matter of pure theory. It is plain that our law does not cover all the facts. A man's choice may be determined by some mental or emotional disturbance, by some trivial experience in his own past, to such an extent that it cannot really be called "his" act or "his" choice at all. He may believe that it is his deliberate choice, whereas really he was impelled to it by some buried and possibly unconscious motive. We have looked at instances of this already. On the other hand, he may disown his act and declare that it is not really "his" at all. "I chose that, but because I couldn't help it : it was not I but sin dwelling in me"—such is the sort of account the man would give of it. In cases like this, suggestion avails little.

A medical friend has pointed out to me that Coué's methods are almost entirely concerned with symptoms rather than with causes. It would be no cure for measles, obviously, to apply ointment to the spots ; nor would it be to "suggest" the spots away. And anyone can think of many instances where, for successful psycho-therapy, something more than suggestion is required. For example, some moral or emotional crisis may have caused a patient acute indigestion, as well as its more direct psychical consequences. Here it would not be much use to suggest to the patient that he will be able to enjoy his dinner. That will leave untouched the

SUGGESTION AND WILL

real cause of the trouble. There must first be a process of analysis, revealing what is ultimately the matter, before suggestion can be used successfully.¹

And this is even more obvious in the moral sphere.¹ A man's inability to believe that the thing he desires or knows to be binding upon him can in fact be achieved, may be due to some pathological cause. Ill-treatment in his childhood may have left him with an "inferiority complex," so that "faith" is scarcely possible until the cause has been analysed and removed. Or, again, a formed evil habit may be the result of abuse many years ago, and must be traced back and dealt with at its source. Or his inability to choose freely and cut himself loose from the fetters of his past may be due to remorse or a sense of guilt unforgiven. In these and many similar instances we can see that the problem cuts down very much deeper than the "law of reversed effort" would admit. It is no good saying that a man is powerless "so long as he thinks he is and no longer." The point is that he just cannot think otherwise. In other words, it ignores the whole difficulty if we say suggestion can here reinforce the will. The man's need is far more radical. *Something has gone wrong with the will itself.* The "whole" will, the will that is victorious, is only possible when that has been cured. Something remedial has got to happen in the very core of personality : the man has got to

¹ The underlying cause of moral delinquency may no doubt often be rather physiological than strictly psychological ; e.g., it may be due to excessive or deficient secretions in the endocrine glands, or to cerebral injuries, and so on. Those who are interested in this aspect of the question should consult such books as Dr Bernard Hollander's *The Psychology of Misconduct*, or an excellent series of articles on juvenile delinquency recently published in *Psyche* (1922).

CHRISTIANITY AND PSYCHOLOGY

become a changed man. In other words, we are here brought face to face with the need for what Religion calls "redemption."

Moreover, quite apart from Psychology, our own most obvious experiences force us daily to the same conclusion. We know that often we are quite unable to will what we know quite well we ought to will. As the Bishop of Manchester has put the position: "I can be good if I will but I won't." The will cannot move itself. There is some disease of impotence upon it. Our inner selves require to be made whole. Or, again, there are none of us but must admit that knowing perfectly well what the right choice is, we quite deliberately choose the wrong. This may sometimes be due, as we saw just now, to a pathological condition which needs mental analysis to cure it. But it may be due to "inner cussedness," that is to which theology calls "sin." This is a fact from which there is no escape. And it means that while it is demonstrably true that suggestion is a strangely potent instrument, yet suggestion by itself is not enough. It costs more than that to redeem men's souls. Some new thing has to happen to *ourselves*.

It is fundamentally necessary to recognize this. For it introduces a wide qualification into claims for the omnipotence of "suggestion." The method needs something far more radical, prior to or side by side with it, before its best results can be achieved. And this must be borne in mind later on when we come to examine the methods of Jesus Christ. We shall see Him frequently "suggesting" escape from evil and disease, renewed power and recovered faith

SUGGESTION AND WILL

in God. But it surely is true that His suggestions "work" just because they are His suggestions, that is because He (or His living Spirit) penetrates and changes the innermost heart of those people whom He influences.

There is also the converse of what we have just stated. Our "character," as we say, the men we are, are largely if not entirely the resultant of our constant and repeated acts of choice. The whole of life is a series of alternatives ; choice confronts us at every step of the way ; and according as we choose, so are our characters. "Sow an act and you reap a habit : sow a habit and you reap a character." So that a life can reach its highest level only by stern and continued loyalty, exercised in our hourly, trivial choices, to the highest that we know. I believe that this law held of Our Lord Himself. I cannot believe that the Incarnation can be stated in wholly metaphysical terms, as though it made no demands upon Himself. His life is stripped, for me, of half its glory unless there was always away on the horizon at least the theoretical possibility of a choice which would be disloyalty to God's will. The temptation-story would have no real meaning unless there was there a desperately hard choice, achieved by Him "with strong crying and tears." He "through eternal Spirit offered Himself without spot to God" : but He lets us into the secret of what it cost Him. "Ye are they," He said to the disciples, "who have continued with Me in My temptations." The life which perfectly embodied the Mind and Will of the Eternal was a life of sustained and costly loyalty.

CHRISTIANITY AND PSYCHOLOGY

Now, of these choices which have to be made continually, many are chiefly concerned with suggestions. We have to be constantly on our guard, constantly training and exercising ourselves, to refuse the wrong impulse and the wrong suggestion which would play such havoc in our lives, and putting the counter-suggestion in its place. The religious man knows plainly enough, of course, that this is something far too difficult to be done by his own unaided efforts. It needs the "assistance" of the Holy Spirit. On the other hand, he knows, equally clearly, that only by such continued self-discipline can he open his soul to the influence of the Spirit. And, unsatisfactory though it may be as logic, I do not think that the facts of life itself allow us to avoid this "circular" statement.

It would thus be an entirely false conclusion to argue, as many people do at present, that to recognize the power of the unconscious and the tremendous potency of suggestion, throws any doubt on the primacy of the will.¹ The true conclusion is the very opposite. And this is no mere academic point : it is one of high practical importance. For it is freely taught by enthusiasts that we need not worry about training the will : we need not lament our broken resolutions : all we need to do is to repeat our formulas and enter by magic into the Kingdom of Heaven. This is, in the highest degree, morally dangerous : and it is dangerous because it is not true. We may here pass over the absurdity involved in stating that a deliberate resolve to suspend our

¹ Cf. Tansley, p. 259: "Over the springs themselves, the most highly developed mind and the most powerful will can have no control."

SUGGESTION AND WILL

volitional activities is the same as to give up exercising our wills, when in fact it is obviously an act of will. ("I resolve to make no more resolutions.") We need only observe that all we know of suggestion throws a new and stronger emphasis on the function of the will, and the need for trained habits and disciplined characters. The extent to which a suggestion is accepted—*i.e.* passes from hetero- to self-suggestion—depends upon the characters that we are. Once the suggestion has been accepted, its working appears to pass out of our own control. But we can control our suggestions *at source*. According to our trained and conscious purpose, so are the suggestions that we accept. We can by "will," very largely, choose our interests: and our vital energies flow along these channels. "Where your treasure is, there will your heart be also," as the Master said upon this very point. The suggestions that, as we say, appeal to us, are those which are in sympathy with our character—the determined, conscious purpose of our lives.

Thus success or failure in life, whether we attach to those terms the highest or the lowest moral quality, depend on training ourselves by stern self-discipline to be suggestible to the right suggestions and impervious to those that are inconsistent with them. We shall try to show in a later chapter that the religious life may be represented, in part, as a trained openness of mind to those suggestions that may be called "Divine," and resistance to those that may be called "Satanic."

It is hardly possible to exaggerate the extent to which our lives are vitiated by accepting deleterious

CHRISTIANITY AND PSYCHOLOGY

suggestions. Baudouin gives, as simple illustrations, the familiar facts of "getting up tired," of "always having a headache on Mondays," of "feeling sick when we sit with our back to the engine," and a host of similar more or less trivial cases.¹ But it cuts very deep. Nobody who has had any experience of adolescents, indeed, we can almost say of adolescence, can fail to recall instance after instance of the way in which a pernicious moral habit has become a task-master in mature life through a wrong suggestion accepted from another in boyhood, or even in unconscious infancy. The answer of the historic Christian Church is, of course, the practice of infant-baptism, whereby the growing life is exposed to the influence of counter-suggestions from Christ and the Christian society. He is transplanted, as the old language would put it, from the kingdom of sin into the kingdom of Grace. For Grace means just the sum of those suggestions which God offers to the human soul.²

It must be noticed that the path for most of us, in our struggle for spiritual advance, is beset by noxious suggestions. The way of victory is to neutralize these dangers by a trained habit of will and character formed and stable enough to reject their influence, expel them, as it were, from our system, and to welcome such suggestions as will help us. The whole apparatus of "Catholic" devotion, approved and tested by twenty centuries of profound spiritual experience, is a magnificent attempt to assist the formation of such habits, and to give a firm

¹ See Pym, p. 34*ff.*, for further illustrations.

² Webb, *Problems in the Relation of God and Man*, pp. 120-121.

SUGGESTION AND WILL

direction to the will. It certainly cannot be lightly set aside. On the other hand, it must be realized that the whole of it is, after all, but a means to an end. The constant danger of institutional religion is to make the means into an end in its own right, as though the object of religious training were to train a man to perform religious exercises. Obviously the object of both of them is to train him to know and do the will of God. So that if for any reason it should be found that other means and other methods achieve that end better than those which are customary, we are plainly free, and, indeed, bound to use them. In everything connected with the Spirit, to attempt to standardize it is to destroy. "To form habits is to fail in life," unless we form them for some further purpose. No doubt we need continual reminder—it is hard for religious people to believe it—that the Sabbath was made for man, not man for the Sabbath. No doubt it is a temptation to the clergy to talk to people as though "going to Church" is the end for which they were made, so that they worship religion rather than God. Some criticism on this score may be deserved. Yet, when all this has been said, it remains true that, faced as we are with these tremendous forces pressing in upon us from every side, the formation of religious habits is of really primary importance in the pilgrimage towards moral freedom. For saying our prayers is like smoking, or writing home: if we drop the habit, we lose the taste for it. And thereby we cut ourselves off from the Source of Power, and expose ourselves to demoralizing suggestions.

Here we reach the point where this discussion

CHRISTIANITY AND PSYCHOLOGY

passes over into that of a later lecture—the bearing of suggestion on the prayer-life. For may we not say, in the language of psychology, that it is the work of the Holy Spirit in us which disposes us to accept from God good “ suggestions ” and make them our own, so that they bring forth the harvest of the Spirit ? The Easter collect seems to say as much : “ Almighty God . . . we humbly beseech Thee that as by Thy special grace preventing us *Thou dost put into our minds good desires*, so by Thy continual help we may bring the same to good effect.”

We have now given, in the briefest summary, a statement of a few of the leading theories with which Psychology is to-day concerned. That was a necessary preliminary. We can now pass to a task more delicate though perhaps more interesting and repaying, and attempt to suggest how Christianity partly anticipates and wholly satisfies the needs of the soul as Psychology declares them.

CHAPTER IV.

PSYCHOLOGY AND THE RELIGIOUS LIFE.

So far, I have merely tried to give an unadorned statement of the barest facts presented to us by Psychology concerning the actual machinery of the mind. There is nothing whatever new in what I have written : it is simply reproduced from the best-known books. It would be unwarrantable impertinence to do otherwise than follow the experts. My own contribution (such as it is) only begins now that the facts are stated. For it goes without saying that to know a little about the way in which our minds do work cannot fail to be useful to everyone of us in trying to make the best of our lives, and to live in right relationship with God. It is also obviously of prime importance to all clergy and students for the Ministry who want to take seriously the "cure of souls." Certainly, experience suggests that to master the general principles of the subject enables one to be of some slight use to some few people in situations which would otherwise have left one wholly baffled. We ought all of us surely to know at least the elements of the science of the mind as part of our professional equipment ; and some of the things that are taught at theological colleges might be spared, if necessary, to make room for it.

CHRISTIANITY AND PSYCHOLOGY

In case any clergy should happen to read this book, may I offer them here one or two remarks, though their point is by no means confined to the clergy; for all Christians are, in some degree, responsible for other people's lives.

First, never let us look on people as "cases" of such and such well-known law. *God hates mass-production*: and if we ever think of men as "cases," we can be sure we are losing touch with God. The whole point of the psychological approach is to reverence and understand the individual. Secondly, never let us attempt to practise what is known as psycho-analysis unless we have first had as a preliminary a proper training in it and in Psychology. Yet, having said that, it needs no argument to show that if our main work in the world is to bring the lives of men into touch with God, and to bring the power of God into men's lives, it is well to know how the human soul is made, and to use God's power according to His laws. What advice, for example, are we to give a man who is in the throes of some violent moral battle? Obviously, he must use the power of God. But if we say just that and nothing more, it leaves him altogether in the air. It is our business to know *how* the Divine help can be obtained and the Power applied to win the battle. We are apt to fall back on vague references to prayer. But these, without more exact definition, will not take the inquirer very far: it is possible they may even do positive harm. For prayer misdirected is spiritual poison. It is, for example, accepted common-sense to tell a man if great passion comes upon him he must try to fix

PSYCHOLOGY AND THE RELIGIOUS LIFE

his mind on something else. To think of his temptation only strengthens it. But will it be really otherwise with prayer if he concentrates his prayer on the temptation. He may be only heaping wood on the flames ! (On the other hand, to analyse the temptation, that is, to trace it back to its origin and so see it in its right perspective, may often have the effect of weakening it.) There really is a need for at least some measure of psychological *expertise* for all who dare to take upon themselves the responsibility of being pastors. People who entrust us with their confidence have a right to expect that we shall be able to tell them *how* to open the channels of their lives to the stream of Divine strength and purity.

No one can say anything that is worth saying about “*pastoral theology*” without a very much more mature experience than it is possible for me to claim. I aim at nothing so pretentious. Yet it is in the power of anyone who will read the Gospels eagerly and without prejudice to see how the cardinal teaching of Christianity fits in with the facts which Psychology brings to light, and answers the needs of the soul as we have analysed them. We will try, in what follows, to watch the machinery by which Our Lord worked in His earthly Ministry and His religion works to-day. In other words, let us look at the New Testament as students, for the time being, of Psychology. But let me make clear that I am not concerned in the present part of our discussion with the theology of Christianity, as expressed for example in the creeds, but only with the mental processes in and through which the religion of Jesus works.

The problem of life for every one of us is the pro-

CHRISTIANITY AND PSYCHOLOGY

blem of how to become our true selves—to live at our highest level of power and usefulness in true relationship with God. "Psycho-therapists," said Dr Crichton Miller to the Association of Headmasters, "knew that in 19 out of 20 cases they were dealing with the results of faulty upbringing. Schoolmasters had to raise a new generation of fathers who could be relied upon to give their children spiritual freedom."¹ Christ came to give men life, and life abundantly.

How can we become ourselves ?

To anyone who has not thought much about it there may seem to be a certain absurdity in asking how we are to *become* ourselves. It seems so obvious to common-sense that whether for good or evil we are what we are, and can never possibly become anything else. Yet, on reflection, all of us know cases in which a man has so completely changed that he is, as we commonly say, quite a different man. In whatever language we choose to describe the process, "conversion" is a prime fact of experience. And if we were pressed to explain what had really happened, we should probably say that the man in question—supposing that the change was for the better—had at last begun to be his true self. We commonly say to a naughty child when he or she has become "good again," "Now, there's the real Charlie once more." And, indeed, the whole aim of education—to state a contested question in a phrase—is so to train and stabilize personality as to help children to become themselves; in other words, to give them moral freedom. For freedom plainly cannot mean capri-

¹ *Morning Post*, Jan. 6, 1921.

PSYCHOLOGY AND THE RELIGIOUS LIFE

ciousness : it means true and genuine self-expression, a trained habit of virtuous character. The point is well put in G. K. Chesterton's parable of the man who set out on a voyage of exploration to discover a new and more romantic Brighton beyond the setting of the stars, and when he had found it landed—at Brighton pier. The land is ours all the time, but all of us have to discover and conquer it before we can enter into our inheritance. So, when we speak of "conquering ourselves," we mean entering by conquest a land which was always ours, but is not yet won. This is the story of our moral lives. Self-hood is certainly the birthright of all the sons of God : but it is something we must win by effort. We can also sell it for a mess of pottage. "A true self is something to be made and won, to be held together with pains and labour, not something given to be enjoyed" (Bosanquet).

Now, as is clear from what we have seen already, our lives are only in the true sense *free*, we only become our real selves, when our lives are truly unified. How does Christianity achieve this for us ?

Psychology and Philosophy agree that in the end the only unity of which spiritual life is capable is the unity of purpose. Life is one when every element in it expresses one coherent purpose, great enough to call out all our powers, to give free play to all our faculties, and to unite them all in a single loyalty in one harmonious and compelling aim. The New Testament contains a classic instance of how such unity was in fact achieved under the influence of Christianity in the famous fragment of autobiography given us by St Paul in "Romans." In

CHRISTIANITY AND PSYCHOLOGY

Chapter VII. he reveals the secret of a life which attained to an effectiveness which seems to us, looking back on it, more than human. His bewildering versatility—scholar, mystic, explorer, administrator—his tireless energy and terrific moral power, dazzle us still as we read the record of them. But it had not always been so with him. There had been, in the past, the familiar story of the baffled will and the divided aim, his whole life fragmentary and torn in pieces, the house of his soul divided against itself. He has given us an unsurpassed picture of the loss of power and moral paralysis which this conflict in his soul entailed. “The good is present with me, but how to carry it out I do not know. The good that I will that do I not, the evil that I do not will, I do.” It went to the length of a “dissociation,” like some of the cases of hysteria which we have already noticed. His personality was so disintegrated that some of the lower elements of the self seemed to him an alien and demonic power—“sin” dwelling in him and possessing him.

The change came with the discovery that the Crucified Messiah wanted him. From that moment everything was different. “Who shall deliver me from this body of death? I thank my God through Jesus Christ.” His life was now restored to unity. It was not only that he was in the conventional religious sense “converted”: he became *free* and acquired more power than any he had ever known before. Henceforth his acts and motives were his own: that is to say, he had become himself. For now his thoughts and will and his desires were harnessed to and expressed a new purpose, co-ordinating

PSYCHOLOGY AND THE RELIGIOUS LIFE

and controlling and bringing into an irresistible harmony every faculty within him—the love of Christ which (as he says) “constrained” him. In that servitude he found his freedom.

What we see here is a real “conversion,” in the sense that his life received a new centre. The self-centred life is always chaos, as Our Lord seems never to have tired of saying. When a life is God-centred it is unified, and indeed, as we shall see later on, only so far as they are God-centred can our lives be truly called our own. Here let us note the psychological fact, leaving the philosophy aside at present. Self-committal to one God, that is practical monotheism, is a psychological necessity for any soul that would attain to self-hood. Mr Studdert Kennedy has lately put this in his own characteristic way.¹ But it lies deep down in the core of Our Lord’s teaching that nobody can serve two masters. In that brief and haunting sentence He laid bare half the problems of psychology. And it is not hard, if we look at the best-known records, to trace the ways in which, in His life and teaching, He helped men and women to spiritual freedom. We may quote a few instances out of very many to serve as guides to any who may wish to make this a matter of study for themselves.

1. *We must face our Discords.*

It is plain enough from the Gospels that Our Lord was continually in one form or another forcing people up to decisions. He made of those who

¹ *Food for the Fed-up*, pp. 11-18.

CHRISTIANITY AND PSYCHOLOGY

asked Him for advice more inexorable demands than ever teacher has made before or since. "Unless a man is ready to say good-bye to all that he has, he cannot be My disciple." "I am not come into the world," He said, "to bring peace, but division." "Unto separation (*κρίσιν*) have I come into the world"—that is to say, people have got to choose: they must be wholly for Him, or against Him. Because a half-hearted discipleship that is always looking regretfully over its shoulder at the past would be a life of conflict and paralysis, ineffective and unhappy, not filled with power and joy, as He intended. "Remember Lot's wife"—the type for all of us of the conflict of desires unresolved. He would not have Mr Facing-both-ways. A man who starts with the plough and then looks back "is not suited for the Kingdom of God."

Here we have partly, at least, the explanation of His frequent and quite relentless emphasis on the need for heroic renunciation. A man who wanted to "enter into Life" was told to sell all that he had and cut himself free. We must be ready to part with all we have in order to buy the pearl of greatest price. No price is too great to pay for the treasure of inward peace and liberty. For the fullest self-expression—the abundant life which He came to give to men—demands readiness to self-mutilation. In order to enter upon true life men must pluck out an eye or chop off a hand. Anything that is truly incompatible with the purpose with which we identify ourselves, must be sacrificed unsparingly. He even went sometimes to the length of saying that men must *hate* their father and their mother,

PSYCHOLOGY AND THE RELIGIOUS LIFE

the things that good men hold most dear and sacred —*in comparison with God*. For so long as there is anything at all which we love for its own sake, and apart from God, we are falling short of that “first and great commandment,” which is the secret of all power and freedom. There must be that absolute detachment, that moving away from all things of lesser worth (however high their value in themselves) to find satisfaction only in God Himself before we can say that we do indeed love God. For “your wills will follow the things you care for most.” We cannot be satisfied till we are able to say:

“ Whom have I in heaven but Thee ?

There is none upon earth that I desire in comparison of Thee.”

But then, when the soul has made its renunciation, when all we have and are is consecrated to the one Master-light of all our seeing, we can (as it were) come down the ladder again, seeing all things in the light of God and rejoicing in all that is lovely, true and beautiful.

There is, very likely, a reminiscence of Plato in the interpretation I have suggested. But it is, I hope, nevertheless not untrue to the Master’s mind. For it was He, for whom life meant obedience, who kept back nothing of the tremendous price, who most rejoiced in the world in which He lived and was most keenly conscious of its goodness. Only those who can will Calvary can talk as Jesus did about the lilies. And St Francis, who sacrificed even his self-respect, thought of his Brothers Minor as “God’s

CHRISTIANITY AND PSYCHOLOGY

merry-men." For joy is the music of spiritual harmony.

2. We must Lose Ourselves in order to Find Ourselves.

The arresting note in Our Lord's proclamation of the secret of inner peace and harmony is its startling objectivity. Religion, no doubt, would have been for Him unmeaning except as personal communion with God. Like the prophets, He protests in the name of the mystic inwardness of religion against a mechanical outward Institutionalism. Yet there is no trace in His recorded sayings that He would have been very much in sympathy with our modern emphasis on "religious experience." Indeed, the nearest approach to a definition of His conception of Religion is that it is *doing the will of God*. He would have us look steadily outwards and not inwards—towards God and God's other children, not within at our own religious states. We only find our lives, He was ever insisting, by forgetting all about ourselves and losing self in devotion to the cause. The self-centred life is never unified: it is ever fightings without and fears within. It is in identifying self with a purpose greater than our own, in staking life and our soul's destiny on a spiritual allegiance, in "cancelling" self altogether, that we "find" the selves that we are meant to be. Thus the condition of "entering into life," in its fullest and most pregnant sense, is readiness to throw our souls away. Unless there are things which a man values more than the preservation of his own existence, in whose

PSYCHOLOGY AND THE RELIGIOUS LIFE

service he will count himself as nothing, he can never realize his possibilities or find the meaning of life, which is life in God.

Thus those who would follow in His way of life must cease to think about themselves : they must take their lives in their hands day by day, committed body and soul to the adventure—" venturing neck or nothing, Heaven's success found or earth's failure"—losing themselves in the service of the Kingdom. These are the terms on which they will find their souls. Such is His doctrine of self-realization—as far removed from the prudential motives too often inculcated by the churches as from the barbarous notion of "self-expression," based on a caricature of modern psychology, which is often taught now as the new ethic. Nietzsche repudiated a philosophy on which was built the ethic he disliked. That was an honest and justifiable course. The current teaching about "self-realization" avoids the trouble of thinking what it means by vague references to the New Psychology, the teaching of which—if people would only read it—points in the very opposite direction—that he who is most concerned about himself is the man who most defeats his own object. And it is, after all, but plain common-sense that a man is most healthy and his life most free, when he is (as our phrase runs) "taken out of himself," absorbed in an interest or work which draws out his best power in its service. It is, indeed, the severest condemnation of the present organization of society, that vocation is a luxury which only the wealthy can afford. The vast majority of men and women must accept the first job that is offered them. Few can

CHRISTIANITY AND PSYCHOLOGY

really be said to be occupied in work which is fundamentally worth doing, or in which they can truly lose themselves. Almost all observers are agreed that much of the current unrest and nervous strain, and of the crude demand for self-expression (in the sense in which it can never be obtained) are traceable in great part to this cause.

This cardinal doctrine of "dying to live," which lies so near the heart of the preaching of Jesus, is in full accord with the teaching of psychology. But, while psychology analyses the need, Jesus offers us the answer. For He provides us with the Purpose which demands of us all we have to give and restores to us ourselves in return. Not every "interest" will guarantee the finding of our real personalities. It is possible to gain the whole world "and lose or pay the price of yourself for it." It must be a purpose embedded in Reality, an expression of the Will that made us persons, so that if we merge our own lives in it we shall find the meaning of what we are becoming. Such was what Jesus called the Kingdom of God. That is the all-embracing end of spiritual striving and endeavour, in which all our scattered interests and our fragmentary aspirations find their completion and fulfilment. There is nothing good that is outside the Kingdom. To lay down life for the Kingdom's sake is to find it. If we live for the Kingdom we can become ourselves.

For, whether consciously or unconsciously, we all to some extent live double lives. We are torn between conflicting aims, competing claims, unharmonized desires. But to live for the Kingdom unifies our lives. It demands an undivided alle-

PSYCHOLOGY AND THE RELIGIOUS LIFE

giance in which there is no possibility of conflict. For he that wills the Kingdom wills all good. It is the supreme end of all endeavour, in which all human hopes and aspirations, all that man is and all that he inherits—the Kingdom and the power and the glory—are conserved and guaranteed in God. There is the motive that can make us whole. “*Do not be of doubtful mind,*” He said, “but make God’s Kingdom the centre of your aim, and all these other things shall be added to you.”

Yet it is one thing to know the true aim of life, and quite another to steer ourselves towards it. Knowledge, unfortunately, is not virtue: and will by itself cannot set our powers in motion. The driving-power of life is emotion: the function of knowledge and choice is to guide it. Thus it needs something with some passion in it, something which makes a strong appeal to us, to make us hate the evil and choose the good. And it is the “constraining” power of Our Lord Himself, the response of the heart to His personal appeal, which can lead us to serve the Kingdom He proclaimed. No teaching of the Christian way of life can in the end grip men’s desires and wills unless the Teacher Himself is in the centre. To yield to Him is to become ourselves.

Recall, at this point, what was said in a previous lecture about the harmonizing of our “complexes.” When a man is passionately in love, the strong emotional associations which centre round the person of his beloved tend to draw all other associations into that one whole of thought and desire. He thinks in terms of her about everything: any chance event or incident becomes charged with his ruling

CHRISTIANITY AND PSYCHOLOGY

passion and tends to recall her to his thoughts : wherever he goes, however he is occupied, she is always present to his mind and supplies the motive of everything he does. In a perfectly literal sense she fills his mind. He thinks and wills and desires nothing which is not controlled by his dominant interest. He loses himself in another. So it is when in any real sense a disciple has fallen in love with the Master. All his various associations, each with their own motives and activities, will tend more and more to be taken up and unified in that one all-pervading loyalty. He will take his life in his hand —and follow. And because, as Christians hold, that Master is the revelation of the soul of the world, his life will be completed and made his own in growing correspondence and accord with the Will that rules the Universe. He has found the truth, and the truth will set him free.

3. Jesus and Human Personality.

The first and most important practical lesson which is to be learned from the New Psychology is increased respect for individuality. With its application to educational practice, the old barbarous methods of mass-production and standardized external discipline are being rapidly transformed. The "average boy" is already obsolete, and attempts are being made in all directions so to remodel the educational system as to help the child to become himself, rather than (as of old) to impose upon him ideas, habits, and a code of morals which other people regarded as good for him. It is much to be

PSYCHOLOGY AND THE RELIGIOUS LIFE

hoped that the method used in Church will soon catch up with the method used in school. For there is no aspect of our subject where psychology is more emphatically forcing us back to the outlook of Our Lord. His respect for human personality—the corollary of His certainty of God—was the foundation of His approach to men. It would have been easy for Him to dominate: it was very hard for Him to abstain from doing so—that was part of the struggle in the wilderness. He decided then that He would go to men taking nothing in His hands save the gift of spiritual freedom. He would have no kingdom of “enlightened despotism,” even though His Father’s will were ruler in it; He would have no forcing of men’s loyalty by the massive weight of supernaturalism. The Kingdom of God should be “in their hearts”: He would call men to the adventure of being themselves. So he took them freedom—and they were afraid of it, as His Church has been afraid of it ever since. The forces of reaction and materialism and all upholders of government “from above” were perfectly right in their terrified recognition that He was the greatest danger that ever had threatened them. And it is as true now as it was at the Crucifixion. Where the Spirit of Jesus is, there is liberty.

But it is extraordinarily difficult for religious teachers to learn His mind on this point. We like—to quote His own biting comment—to tyrannize over other people and so to be called their benefactors! We are always apt to approve of docile people: but we ought to regard them as our worst failures. Jesus criticized the clergy of the Church

CHRISTIANITY AND PSYCHOLOGY

of which He was a devoted member because they "bound heavy burdens grievous to be borne" on the shoulders of their congregations,—trying to force a uniform rule and standard of religious life and practice on them all. He claimed for Himself a new method in religious education. He invited men to enter a new school and take the "yoke" of a new teaching on them. "My yoke is easy and my burden is light." For He would bring them into touch with God, the God of Abraham and Isaac, to whom personality is dear, so that in communion with the Father they might freely become what they were meant to be.

The whole method of His Ministry is individual through and through. He showed a scrupulous, almost religious reverence for the individual constitution. Persons (He taught) are supremely valuable. A man is better than a sheep : he is better than the Sabbath day. Persons must not be sacrificed to things, nor to the demands of Institutionalism. His teaching aimed at challenging dull minds and awakening in them the search for truth, rather than at imparting information. His cures were cures of patients, not of diseases. In every case there was a different method. His counsel and advice to those who sought it in their moral and spiritual difficulties was advice to Simon or to Thomas, not moral theology stated in general terms. Indeed, it is often fairly possible to reconstruct the personal history of those who pass across the Gospel story by studying the way in which He treated them ; and that is the best way of learning the "cure of souls." We are drifting away altogether from His

PSYCHOLOGY AND THE RELIGIOUS LIFE

method if we allow ourselves to attempt to make people what we think they ought to be. The question is, What does God want them to become? To produce a "type" in a church or a school or college is the condemnation of its system. For nobody who has become (in the words of Jesus) a student in the school of the Kingdom of God will try to do what God never does, and impose an idea or a method of life or worship—however true or useful it may be—on the soul of another person. This reverence for personality must be the foundation of all true education. (But note what has to be said on the other side—Chap. VI. below.)

And the Kingdom of God which Jesus came to proclaim is rooted in God's personality and the uniqueness of individual persons. Jesus gave to the old expectations about the Kingdom which was to come a definitely personal interpretation. "It all depends on the soil. It is best illustrated by the merchant, or the seeker after buried treasure. Like a net, it is flung wide round all sorts of people." In all cases, He seems to stress the personal factor. And, in the end, we can attach no meaning to the consummation of God's Kingdom short of the perfected and complete communion of all persons with the love of God, and thereby with one another. It is somewhere near Augustine's wonderful phrase: "The most perfectly harmonious and organized society enjoying God and one another in God."¹

This respect for personal freedom and development was learnt by the greatest of His disciples. It

¹ *Concordatissima et ordinatissima societas fruendi Deo et invicem in Deo.*

CHRISTIANITY AND PSYCHOLOGY

must have been difficult for St Paul, with his ardent nature and his gift for organizing. But nowhere is his greatness seen more brilliantly than in his deliberate refusal to standardize the churches which he founded, or the individuals composing them. "As every man has been called, so let him abide." It needed, he knew, the unique contribution which each man makes simply by being himself (reflecting in that mirror the glory of God) to "form Christ" in the human race. The Church has not always been so wise as this, nor her teachers always so wise as the Church herself. But when Christian inspiration was at its height, it is hard to trace any sign of the belief that uniformity is desirable.

Thus the conclusion of this psychology, leading us to a fresh eagerness to study and respect the individual, lead us back to the methods of the Gospels. And the teaching and practice of Our Lord, and of those who "had His mind" in the early Church, may now be understood with added clearness to inspire and (if need be) redirect our methods. The result should be not only an added freshness and spontaneity in the Church's life, but also a wider range of catholicity.

4. *Guilt and Forgiveness.*

There are many obstacles to power and freedom which have to be passed on the journey towards self-hood, but few so difficult as the sense of guilt. Few things so disintegrate our lives (by repression and dissociation), and so paralyse our effort for the future as self-reproach and remorse about the past. All psychologists would agree in this, even if they should

PSYCHOLOGY AND THE RELIGIOUS LIFE

hold, as those must hold who adopt a thorough-going determinism, that the sense of guilt is itself a delusion of which psychological treatment can relieve us. Delusion or not, the sense of guilt is a fact of universal human experience ; and all religions above the primitive level have ever sought for ways of release from it, as the condition of effective living. It was by a profound intuition into the deepest needs of human life, as well as understanding of God's character, that the saints and spiritual experts have always insisted on penitence and pardon as the preliminaries of moral progress. We can see now the soundness of their psychology. For not only is the sense of guilt the great disturber of our inner peace, but also, by the laws of suggestion, the memory of wrong-doing haunting the mind is itself a temptation to repeat it. Thus sin which we believe to be unforgiven is a potent cause of temptation. So that the belief that one can be forgiven, however that belief may be acquired and on whatever grounds it may be accepted, is itself of first-rate psychological importance. As remorse must paralyse our moral energies, so the belief that we have been forgiven (if such a belief can in any way be won) will be one of the chief ways of setting us free.

There is no doubt that to tell someone else about the repressed secret which is haunting us will itself be one of the ways of setting us free. To dig up the hidden complex so that the patient is no longer haunted by it, is often enough to restore his life to unity. In line with the modern methods of psychologists is the old religious practice of confession. It is older by far, of course, than Christianity, and

CHRISTIANITY AND PSYCHOLOGY

was widely taught in the Hellenistic world. Indeed, it is possible to risk a guess whether some of the priests of Asklepios and of some forms of the Mystery-worships, as well as the professors of Philosophy, who were in effect spiritual directors, may not have stumbled upon some of the secrets of what we now call psycho-analysis. In any case, confession was a practice recommended by the healers of soul and body widely and long before Christianity came. The Church very wisely took it over, like everything else that was good in the older culture.

Confession to God seems to have played a part in nearly all known forms of Religion. The sense of release which it brings the penitent is an undeniable fact of experience. "Confession to men"—which so many people vilify—is an equally common and liberating process. There can be no fireside consecrated to true friendship where confessions are not sympathetically heard. There is nothing disputable about these two cases. But the Christian religion, in its historic forms, has offered a combination of the two. It has taught men to confess their sins to God either openly before the congregation or privately "in the presence of a priest." The penitent thus seeks both forgiveness from God (and, in the former case, from his fellow-Christians) and also the help and advice of a human friend. Many people find this unnecessary: they can approach God immediately and receive the certainty of His forgiveness. But it seems to me a plain matter of experience (quite apart from any ecclesiastical "views") that many people in many circumstances do gain from confession "in the presence of a

PSYCHOLOGY AND THE RELIGIOUS LIFE

priest " a sense of liberation and release which is not guaranteed for them by other methods. It may be possibly that the human touch opens for them avenues to God. Or it may be that the greater effort involved in so searching a test of sincerity leaves behind it a clearer sense of freedom. Whatever the reason, the fact is, I think, undoubted. This sacramental form of confession is ceasing at last to be a party issue ; and people of all schools of thought have recourse to it, to their great relief. It is often obviously of the highest value. We may well rejoice that people are not deterred by the ties of outworn party-loyalties from a practice which has proved itself so valuable.

But two things need to be constantly remembered:

(1) Such confession is a " treatment " : it is not a regular regimen for life. Castor-oil may save a man's life at times ; but it would not be found very nourishing as a daily substitute for breakfast-coffee. Personally, I stand out for confession. I refused to be terrorized by party-slogans from a God-given method of spiritual help. But a dominant school in the English Church to-day seems to me to be seriously in danger of turning a real and sacred means of grace into a mechanical kind of fetish. To teach the necessity of frequent confession as a primary part of Christian duty would appear to be psychologically unsound. It serves to defeat its own object.¹ It reminds one of the old-

¹ But there is an excellent resumé by Dr Hadfield of the difference between confession and psycho-analysis, and the need for occasional repetition of the former (the latter being a " radical cure "), quoted in Kirk, *Principles of Moral Theology*, Preface, p. xvii., footnote ; see also *ibid.*, p. 161, note.

CHRISTIANITY AND PSYCHOLOGY

fashioned type of nursemaid who used to administer "doses" once a week, regardless of whether or no the child needed them. And the child grew up with a weakened constitution. But the object of any spiritual adviser, whether friend, psychologist or priest, should surely be to make himself unnecessary.

(2) In so far as advice (or "counsel") is offered by the confessor to the penitent—and without it much of the value must be lost—we must recognize the imperative necessity of psychological training for the priest, lest he do positive harm to those he serves. "It is a hard thing to be good," said Aristotle—and harder still to help other people. It is also probable that there are cases where only the specialist has skill to help. There are certainly cases where the priest must be humble enough to pass his task on to the trained psycho-analyst.

But, plainly, if a man haunted by remorse has recourse to confession to obtain relief, what he wants is not merely good advice. He wants to know that he has been forgiven. There are cases, of course, where the sense of guilt is delusory. A man may bitterly reproach himself for something that is not really "sin" at all. What he chiefly needs then is enlightenment, whether physiological or psychological. There are cases, too, in which a sense of remorse may not be a consciousness of *guilt* at all; it may be a strange pathological domination by some repressed complex from the past. Here, too, the chief need is again enlightenment; though it frequently costs a searching process of faithful analysis before it can be had. Yet if a man is oppressed by a sense of guilt which really is guilt

PSYCHOLOGY AND THE RELIGIOUS LIFE

in the court of conscience, then it is Christian forgiveness which can best set free his moral energies. Guilt is the great repressor of psychic freedom. First because, from the religious standpoint, it puts us out of right relations with the Divine source of Power. Secondly because, on psychological grounds, it leads to conflict and repression, and all the waste of power which this involves. To be forgiven, and know it, is to be set free. So it was that in dealing with physical sickness Jesus began by the promise of forgiveness.

It is Jesus who can bring us this release. For He brings near to us a forgiving God of whose forgiveness we may be assured by the gift of fresh opportunities of service. For Psychology here agrees with Christianity that deliverance or redemption is completed by losing ourselves again in eager service, rather than by a merely passive experience or a transaction performed outside ourselves.

5. Christianity and Instinct.

In Chapter I. we saw how fundamental are the Primary Instincts in our constitution. We have also discussed the teaching of psychology about their redirection or sublimation. Broadly, and on the whole, it is plainly true that Christianity agrees with the attitude of the psychologists. And this is true, I believe, of no other religion to anything like the same extent. Stoicism, for instance, when confronted with the impulses of our physical nature, says, in effect, Pretend they are not there. Some of the great religions of the East regard them as evil in

CHRISTIANITY AND PSYCHOLOGY

themselves, to be eradicated or sloughed off by the soul in its purgation. Yet human experience certainly corroborates the scientific conclusion of psychologists. The attempt to eradicate the “desires of the flesh” stimulates all the temptations of St Anthony. Christianity agrees. It is true that there have been, from time to time, outbreaks of exaggerated asceticism: but these are quite off the line of the true tradition. The Christian attitude to our animal instincts is that they are not evil in themselves, but potentially instruments of the Spirit of God. What matters is the end for which we use them. Sin, as the theologians would put it, lies not in the instinct but in its perversion. Obviously, a religion which is founded on an Incarnation in the flesh cannot possibly say anything else.

If the body is the “Temple of the Spirit,” then it must follow that our instincts are made by God for God, to become the instruments of His Spirit. And ultimately all our hardest problems in the practice of religion, considered from their human side, are grouped round the problems of our instincts. We talk, rather loosely, about the “religious instinct”; but in truth it seems to be the case that there is not any such specific instinct. Religion is not one activity: it is life transformed and redirected. It is true that man is “incurably religious”; but the great religious conations and emotions seem to be compounded and built up out of those connected with the primary instincts—love, awe, curiosity, etc.—as they react to the slowly perceived stimulus of the spiritual factor in environment. Our religious

PSYCHOLOGY AND THE RELIGIOUS LIFE

life, too, has evolved out of the simplest modes of reflex action, as with gradually developing consciousness man has become increasingly aware of the Reality which encompasses him—"in Whom he lives and moves and has his being." Thus the very existence of religion and the ineradicable hunger for it which endures through all our passing generations is itself the best and most notable example of the "sublimation" of our instincts by influences that derive from a higher Order. This suggestibility to the Unseen has now become part of our racial inheritance. We have only to note now how this redirection of a baffled or perverted instinct in the case of any given individual can be achieved by Christianity.

It is striking to notice, in the Synoptic records, how seldom Jesus is found denouncing sin. He is hardly ever saying "Don't do it": there are no negations in His teaching. His whole concern is to show the way and the life for which mankind in the knowledge of God is made, and to point men to its unbounded possibilities. He was offering men the "life of the world to come." We are just beginning now to rediscover this cardinal point in His psychology. Negative teaching or negative prayer is useless. It is not really likely to help much if we tell a selfish child not to be selfish. We need to show him bigger things to live for. In the same way, following the laws which we have discussed in the chapter on Suggestion, we shall see that it will not greatly avail a man to pray *against* a temptation that assails him. He should pray for the good which is its opposite, that his feelings and desires may

CHRISTIANITY AND PSYCHOLOGY

stream towards it. The positive goodness is what he should emphasize in his prayer, and in his whole endeavour. All of us would, presumably, agree with this. But we have to remember that this is the right method of dealing with all the great primary instincts—of the herd, of sex, of pugnacity, etc.—which cause such havoc in life till they are tamed. They, too, have to be trained to find their outlet in the service of the Master and His Kingdom.

Perhaps in different forms the herd instinct lies at the root of two-thirds of our moral troubles. “Evil communications corrupt good manners”—as the A.V. curiously translates it: group-claims come into violent collision. The “gang-spirit,” for example, which supplies the impulse for so much juvenile crime, is but one manifestation of this instinct. But the boy who “knows a better” gang will “go to it”: and there is the obvious clue for dealing with him. This particular example is everywhere recognized and admitted now: and it contains the whole essential principle. In most spheres of life, common-sense and accumulated experience have combined to reach the true conclusion, and to put into practice the right methods. But we still hesitate unwarrantably to extend it into the domain of sex, and it seems that some elementary discussion of this matter should be attempted here. For while it is an entire misrepresentation to suggest that the New Psychology is “all about sex,” yet it is the fact that for almost every man the battle for self-control and purity is the sternest fact in his moral experience. It is here that a scientific outlook and a true and sane principle of teaching are

PSYCHOLOGY AND THE RELIGIOUS LIFE

imperatively necessary. The central point has been already emphasized. It is not the slightest use to be merely negative. "Self-control" is an impossibility except as an aspect of self-realization. If, then, we seek to cure ourselves or others of some form or other of sexual irregularity, we must remember that we are dealing with the perversion of an instinct. A good instinct has "gone wrong." Thus we must start from the stage further back, and direct the instinct which brings the trouble to us into another and legitimate channel. That is the only possible way to "fight" it.

Let us see how this can be stated in Christian terms.

We should start, there is little doubt, from the frank admission that what for psychology is the "sex-instinct" is for us the *creative love of God*—a delegated power of creation, to be used for ends in accordance with His will. For the purity of the Christian ideal is not the cold impassive "moderation" of Aristotle or the Stoics, but a passionate and active loyalty, a life dedicated to Christ-like energies. The love-energy, like all others, is to be consecrated to our Lord, and redirected in His service. Now this impulse is creative power : it is, in fact, the only power we have for creative work of any kind. And the gifts which have been entrusted to us are not (we are told) to be laid up in a napkin, but to be employed constructively. Thus it is as disloyal in religion as it is unsound in psychology to let our creative energies run to waste, or even to remain unrealized. They have got to be always used for creating something. We have, then, here, the

CHRISTIANITY AND PSYCHOLOGY

Christian parallel to the axiom of the psycho-analyst, that mental and spiritual health demands the fullest possible measure of self-expression. The *libido*, that is to say, the vital impulse, the "drive" or onward march of personality, which is the force that operates in instinct, must be ever setting towards new "interests," so that the psychic life may not stagnate but realize itself in increasing fullness. When for any reason the *libido* is dammed, the stream of psychic life is poisoned. The ethical appeal of Christianity coincides in a most remarkable way with the result of medical inquiry. Only it is far more interested in the fullest expression of loyalty to Christ than in a mere avoidance of "neurosis." The instinct of sex, we say, is given to us by God for creative purposes. And such of its energy as cannot be used for creating other personalities must not be wasted in gross self-indulgence: it has got to be used for creating other things, to the glory of God.

Thus we shall seek with every kind of resourcefulness new outlets for this vital impulse. It can flow along the lines of other instincts, the parental, for example, or the combative—expressing itself in running a troop of scouts or in fighting against some flagrant social wrong. These or a hundred other different interests, inspired by devotion to the Master, and consecrated to His service, supply the ideal "new affection" leading us to express ourselves creatively to the glory of God and the relief of man's estate. And I do not feel the slightest hesitation in claiming that in principle and essence this was the method adopted by Our Lord.

PSYCHOLOGY AND THE RELIGIOUS LIFE

His attitude can be even more clearly seen in the example of another instinct very closely connected with that of sex—the fighting instinct of *pugnacity*. It is, perhaps, the most violently destructive and anti-social of all our impulses. The moral training of youth is chiefly concerned with the discipline and control of its activities. For the first great lesson learned by the small boy in the earlier stages of his education is, as Mr Kipling has expressed it, “to keep his mouth shut and his pores open.” Gradually he finds his fighting instinct transferred to the service of his house, his school, his college, his family, his country. The individual is “socialized” by training this instinct in a new direction. And Dr McDougall has shown, in *The Group Mind*, how in the evolution of society, this inherently disruptive force has become a stabilizing and binding influence. But the world has just learnt in a frightful war that the instinct is still ruinously active. It has been transferred from the individual to the service of the group : it is not yet trained to be anything but destructive. The smallest pretext will provoke a war. For at present no “end” is commonly recognized with an appeal sufficiently tremendous to draw off this most dangerous of instincts into constructive, peaceful enterprises.

But again Christianity supplies the need. It offers the adventure of the Kingdom. Our Lord loved “fighters.” He frequently suggested that it was this kind of temperament of which His Kingdom specially stands in need. “The Kingdom of Heaven suffers violence and violent men take it by force,” He said. He chose a Sinn Feiner—

CHRISTIANITY AND PSYCHOLOGY

Simon the Zealot—to be of the inner circle of the Twelve. He brought into the world a new ideal and offered people an adventurous service. He sought to enlist them in His great Crusade. He appealed to all that in men is heroic. There must be no looking back, He said. There must be no prudential calculation. It is an adventure that may cost your life and only those who are ready for that must follow. And all through history thousands of men and women have taken service under Him as “Captain,” sublimating their combative impulses in perilous enterprises and dauntless loyalty for the sake of the Kingdom which is to come. This is the record of martyrs and pioneers in all branches of the Master’s army.

Only the Kingdom of God is great enough and exacting enough in its demands to supply the “moral equivalent for war.” And on that civilization to-day depends. Mr H. G. Wells’ book *God the Invisible King* will be still gratefully remembered; and it is in the true spirit of Christ’s teaching that Dr McDougall finds the substitute for international war in a rivalry in serving and developing backward peoples.

So it can be with the creative instinct. It, too, can be enlisted for the Kingdom. For the Kingdom of God—as we have seen already—embraces every form of human good. There is nothing good which is outside the Kingdom: it means the perfection of God realized on earth. In its service we are called to spend all that we have it in us to become, all that we have the power of creating. In the cause of the Kingdom that tumultuous stream which surges

PSYCHOLOGY AND THE RELIGIOUS LIFE

irresistibly through our nature, overflowing all the dams and sluices and impregnating the whole of our psychic life, can spend itself constructively and divinely.

How, then, shall all this be applied to ourselves, or to other people for whom we may be responsible ? If the lines of our argument are sound, we shall not stop short at advice or resolutions to "conquer" our sexual temptations. The accepted "physical" advice we shall certainly give and follow ; but there must be something more. It is, after all, much more a psychological than a physical problem—apart from its moral aspect. We shall certainly dwell upon the power of God and the mastery of Spirit over matter. But we shall start with a positive, thrilling challenge to consecrate this best gift of life in active citizenship of that Kingdom of which we have been made "inheritors." We shall not try merely to encourage a brave resistance to this impulse ; by prayer and sacraments we shall try to *consecrate* it. If we are trying to help an adolescent we shall tell him what it is—creative power, given him to co-operate with God ; and show him how Our Lord would have him use it. He will understand then *why* the sin is sinful and why he must doggedly avoid "occasions" of it. And at once we turn his thoughts (on which all depends) from preoccupation with his own temptations to the strongest moral quality he has, namely, loyalty—and that to Christ. (There is the "expulsive power of a new affection.") But, of course, we must go on to be far more concrete. We must set before him definite suggestions for the direction of his

CHRISTIANITY AND PSYCHOLOGY

creative energies in accordance with the will of God. And at this point it becomes a personal problem. "Circumstances define vocation," and the special ways in which he must use this power depend on his gifts, his interests, capacities, all that makes him the actual boy he is. On this we must lavish our patience and ingenuity. It may be in art, it may be in Nature-study ; it may be in looking after another boy or in some achievement for the good of his house or the discharge of some responsibility. More channels than one can probably be opened, and probably the more of them the better ; for the force at his disposal is unlimited, and the fuller our activities, the richer and more fruitful is our life. (It is the lack of a central guiding purpose which "dissipates" energy, not the amount expended.) The whole range of desirable things is there to choose from—all that is honest, lovely, of good report. All that is true to the mind and will of our Lord, God wills that we should create on earth. But the cardinal point is to offer him these activities as what they are—a service to the Lord who claims these powers of his for the Kingdom's sake. We shall, too, try to help him to concentrate his prayers on the sphere of service he has chosen, the creation in which he is offering God his life, rather than on the sin which he is resisting. And we shall be able to lead him on to see that when our wills are set towards God's will, the Power that upholds the Universe stands behind us, so that nothing, literally, is impossible. That faith is the victory that overcomes.

It must, I think, be admitted that at this point

PSYCHOLOGY AND THE RELIGIOUS LIFE

the "Public School System" seriously fails. It is, perhaps, the most damaging criticism which can reasonably be brought against it that it offers such a meagre range of interests by which boys can learn to express themselves. "Work," which most of them naturally dislike, and games, which many only pretend to enjoy, make a scheme far too rigid and unyielding to be an effective educational instrument. The system itself, far more than the dreadful services too often associated with school chapels, militates against a vital religious teaching, and makes moral purity needlessly difficult. But there is a strong tendency now towards enlarging it. And in any case a clearer understanding of the psychological principles involved will lead to such modifications in school-environment as will give the developing life a better chance.

It must not for a moment be supposed that any cheapening of the moral issues is involved in what is here suggested, or any lowering of the claim of purity. We ask for greater, not less, moral effort. We ask that the strongest forces in our nature should be used constructively in unstinting service inspired by loyalty to the Son of Man instead of being wasted or left unrealized. And surely we pitch the appeal a great deal higher by asking for a life of creative devotion than by appeals to physical self-interest, or a moral fiat left unexplained—that this is just something which must not be done. We are putting our Lord in the foreground of the picture, which therefore, I think, cannot be so very far wrong.

In maturer life, the call will be the same, under

CHRISTIANITY AND PSYCHOLOGY

different circumstances and conditions. The Kingdom demands our whole creative effort. Our energies will be flung into art, perhaps, or one of the many forms of social service, or some work of a more heroic order, such as developing a virgin territory, in Government service, or as a missionary. The word of prophecy to-day is "God wills fellowship." There are bridges enough to be built in the world around us across the gulfs that divide man from man to enlist all our powers of creation in the service of the Kingdom. There is truth to be found in countless different spheres, beauty to be achieved and love to be won. There is a League of Nations to be realized, a ruined world to be rebuilt. There is little need to ask: "What am I to do?" The question is rather: "Am I doing it"? We have to face the Christ and answer that.

There, to any who have begun to know Him, is the unescapable challenge to our loyalty, the subduing appeal which alone can fully "order the unruly wills and affections of sinful men." Creative life responds to creative love. It is His call which supplies the new incentive, the passionate "interest" asked for by psychology, to draw our turbulent instincts to Himself and sublimate these energies in His service till they grow to be what God made them to become. It is true in this, as in all other ways, that he that wills to lose his life shall find it.

CHAPTER V.

SUGGESTION AND PRAYER.

IN the last chapter but one we tried to appreciate something of the extraordinary power which suggestion wields both for good and evil. We must now attempt to show the relationship of the facts we have investigated to the teaching of Jesus, and of the Christian faith.

It will strike us at once if we turn to the New Testament with a psychological background in our minds, that His massive insistence upon faith in God as the source of confidence and power comes to meet us just at the point we have reached. "To believe in one's star," as Baudouin observes, is a highway to success in life—if we think, that is, that Napoleon "succeeded." It all depends what we mean by success. But there can be no doubt that the suggestion of a creative love and holiness ever delivering the world from evil, near and available for those who desire it, must be a prime source of power and moral strength. "Why are you frightened?" He asked His dismayed companions: "how little you trust God!"

It is, indeed, hard to resist the conviction that our Lord by a divine intuition was aware of these laws now analysed by psychology, and taught the race the true way of controlling them. For myself,

CHRISTIANITY AND PSYCHOLOGY

I feel sure that many of His cures, both in the physical and moral spheres (though perhaps He would not have accepted the distinction) were worked by this machinery of suggestion. Nor is there anything here that need alarm us, however conservative our attitude. For, if we reflect, it could not be otherwise. Assuming that these hypotheses are right, *i.e.* that these are really "laws" of the mind, and that our Lord, as the Christian faith asserts, revealed the truth about God and human life, then inevitably He must have approached the minds and souls of men and women according to the laws by which God made them. Again and again He was at pains to insist that there are no spiritual short-cuts. The laws of life are what they are and we must submit to the slow, sure processes of organic growth and development—first the grain, then the ear, then the full corn in the ear. From these facts, these laws, He claimed no exemptions. He knew, say the records, what was in man. He regarded with respect and reverence His Father's laws operative in man's being. And on any showing, Christian or non-Christian, His insight into human nature, its needs, its character and its possibilities, was something unapproached in religious history.

But let us make clear, to anticipate misunderstanding, that in all that follows in this chapter we are not concerned with credal interpretations. We cast no doubt on our Lord's "Divinity" by an attempt to gain some understanding of the actual methods of work which He employed. We are only concerned here with the machinery through which, in fact, Jesus taught and healed. To appre-

SUGGESTION AND PRAYER

ciate in Jesus "perfect Man, of a reasonable" (*i.e.* human) "soul and human flesh subsisting" is as integral a part of the Catholic faith, though traditionalists are strangely apt to forget it, as the recognition of His Divinity. In any case, as we shall see later, it is an unwarrantable procedure to argue that if we know (within limits) how certain things are done, it follows that therefore God did not do them. To this we recur in a later chapter. But meanwhile, with this explanation in parenthesis, we can return to our main line of argument.

It would seem that constantly throughout His teaching, our Lord definitely referred to the operation of suggestion. We have seen that a suggestion made by another is powerless until it has been accepted, *i.e.* until it becomes self-suggestion. When once accepted, it brings forth its fruits. So He said, "It is not what comes from without that makes a man unclean. It is *from within, out of the heart of man* that there proceed evil thoughts, adultery, murder, fornication. These things come from within and defile the man." But other recorded sayings may go further. It is commonly said that the best-known part of His teaching in the Sermon on the Mount, about the old commandment and the new, substitutes an inward disposition as the subject of moral aspiration for a tangible and external act, writing "Thou shalt be" for "Thou shalt do." That is true, of course, and it is melancholy to think how little Christian opinion has begun to rise to the height of it even yet. Few of us really believe that to live in hatred or selfishness or unclean imaginations bars the door of the Kingdom of Heaven to us

CHRISTIANITY AND PSYCHOLOGY

as much as committed murder, theft or adultery. But did He not, perhaps, mean more than this? Did He not mean that the imagination is the same thing as the act committed? It was perhaps in a more literal sense than we have been prepared to recognize that He said “a man that looks lustfully on a woman has already committed adultery in his heart.” Once the suggestion has been really welcomed and worked into the substance of our inner lives, it is no longer under our control. It inevitably produces its effect. Our “dominant desire” is our destiny.¹

Hence the utter life-and-death importance of controlling the suggestions we accept while it is still within our own power. People tend to exaggerate the extent to which we are at the mercy of suggestion. The trouble with most of us is not that we are too suggestible—for the more suggestible we are the better: but that we are suggestible to the wrong suggestions. And this, to at least some extent, is our own fault. For suggestions can be controlled “at source,” if we are prepared for the moral struggle of purgation and self-discipline and bitter cost and effort which this involves. It was the repeated statement of the Master, indeed it lies near the heart of His teaching, that the fullest life demands a searching sacrifice. “If your eye leads you wrong, pull it out: if your hand leads you wrong, chop it off.” The religion of “power and love and purity” must be a religion of blood and tears and anguish in the attainment of self-mastery.

There are certain obvious “occasions” of sin,

¹ See Chap. VIII. below.

SUGGESTION AND PRAYER

certain obviously "suggestive" things, which anybody with any moral seriousness knows he must avoid altogether. This is plain without argument in the limited sphere of what are commonly called "sins of the flesh," though they are essentially sins of imagination. There are, of course, certain physiological stimuli by which all normal persons will expect to be sexually excited. But it is inherently likely, and experience seems to suggest that it is true, that each of us, according to his upbringing, his temperament and his individual history, is specially open to some one particular stimulus, often fixed in its association with some particular place, person or object. Everyone knows or should know for himself what is specially dangerous for him. Sometimes, no doubt, there are complications here. It sometimes happens that through some incident in the history of the person concerned a sexual stimulus has become associated with something that is not really sexual. Some tune, some picture, some literary context, sometimes some perfectly absurd object, becomes charged with dangerous suggestions. Instances of this form of perversion which is technically known as "fetishism" can be studied *ad nauseam* in the text-books. Such cases are definitely pathological. It is no good telling a man to avoid this perverted stimulus. An inner compulsion makes that impossible for him. He cannot get free until an analysis, conducted by himself or by someone else, has revealed the underlying cause of the trouble. As soon as that is done it will probably cease. In any case, he knows now what the trouble is and has in his own hands the power of dealing with

CHRISTIANITY AND PSYCHOLOGY

it. Here, then, and in all the other normal cases, there has got to be a complete renunciation, however painful the price that has to be paid. "It is better to limp into Life with one foot than to jump with both feet into Hell."

Here is room for all the moral effort and self-discipline and watchfulness which the most ascetic moralist could ask for. But Our Lord's teaching does not remain on this level of warning and negation. His religion is one of positive faith and power, of holiness that keeps the world sweet, like salt ; and it rests on unbroken communion with the enveloping Presence of the Father. Here we begin to touch the life of prayer.

It is the experience of psycho-therapists that a suggestion markedly incompatible with the general character and outlook of the patient tends to be rejected. The patient cannot be persuaded to take it into himself and make it his own. Thus there is a guardian of the gate at the outer gate of consciousness, as well as the censor hypostatized by Freud who stands between the unconscious and the conscious. This gives us the transition we are needing. For a man who is really trained and disciplined in a constant purpose of "doing the will of God," whose life is thus continually open to the suggestion of power, love and purity, is to a very large extent at least immunized against wrong suggestions. There is nothing from without, as Our Lord said, which can enter into him and defile him. And the object of the life of prayer, which depends in turn on the trained habit of "saying our prayers," is to keep the gate of the mind open to, and appropriate and make

SUGGESTION AND PRAYER

our own increasingly, all those suggestions which come from God. “The lamp of the body is the eye: and if thine eye is single, thy whole body will be full of light.”

If we analyse the experience of the Prophets, we find that they distinguished very scrupulously between those inspirations or suggestions which they held to be definitely divine and those of whose origin they were uncertain. Jeremiah waited once for ten whole days, when every minute of delay was dangerous, to be sure that he had the answer from the Lord.¹ That is, he was careful to mark the distinction between divine and mere self-suggestions. Happy the man who is certain of the difference! It is the mature fruit of the prayer-life. But we may justifiably expect that one who lives in that frank unbroken intercourse with the Heavenly Father which Jesus has made possible, will have playing upon his soul continually a stream of gracious “suggestions” from the Father. And, indeed, it would seem that the whole devotional system of prayer and sacraments in the historic Church rests on the assumption that this is so.

When we look back on the long history of Christian belief and practice, it may seem as though not infrequently the Church, by some divinely-given intuition, has been right in her psychology, in the way, that is, in which she has dealt with souls, while at the same time far from satisfying in the reasons she has given for her practice. The most obvious case in point is Infant Baptism, which every new chapter in psychology, every fresh discovery about

¹ Jeremiah xlvi. 7 : cf. St Paul’s distinction in 1 Cor. vii. 10 and 12.

CHRISTIANITY AND PSYCHOLOGY

the unconscious, show to be more obviously right. We need not be tied to any far-fetched theory about what the formulas call "Original Sin" to be sure of the fundamental faith and wisdom involved in bringing the developing life, even before the appearance of real self-consciousness, under the influence of Christ-suggestions. It is taken a step still further back in the Marriage Service.

One may wonder, indeed, whether the same principle may not run through the whole sacramental system—the implanting in the soul of divine suggestions through visible media charged with reminiscences of the practice of our Lord and His apostles.

It will be objected at once, I am quite aware, that this reduces the "objectivity" of the sacramental Presence to something which is merely suggestion. In reply to this I would ask "why *merely*?" It is doubtful if one can draw a frontier-line with prayer and sacraments on one side of it, and suggestion on the other. There must be a certain debatable territory. And if the suggestion in this case comes from God, it just is not "merely suggestion" in the sense which the objector would intend. Unless "real" means "material," which no Christian is likely to argue seriously, then a sacrament is not less "real," and the grace which it conveys not less "objective" if we should find that it enters into the soul through the machinery which we call "suggestion."

The point which the "objective" view of sacraments (which I myself accept) is concerned to guard, is God's initiative action. There must be something offered to us by God, unconditioned by

SUGGESTION AND PRAYER

our attitude and not called into being by our state of mind—which is what a really “subjective” view would hold. The sacramental system of the Church keeps continually alive this recognition of “Transcendence,” of a supernatural life which is not our own, which we cannot make, but are asked to accept and appropriate, and which can only be drawn from One Source. Without this sense of mystery and transcendence, of reaches and depths in the eternal order which our dimensions cannot fully measure, religion would very quickly dissolve away into mere duty or mere emotionalism. There is no doubt that at least for many of us the historic, sacramental forms of worship help uniquely to keep this sense alive.

I hold that we cannot, with the traditionalist, limit the Church by the circle of its cultus. We cannot say that without the sacraments consecrated by historic usage there is no authentic Christianity. Experience shouts too emphatic a negative. We cannot fetter and bind the living Spirit by any one form of Institutionalism. “We do it wrong, being so majestical, to offer it this show of violence.” Christianity stands or falls, as it seems to me, by nothing else than by the certainty of a Divine life of love and power and joy, a life of Spirit which is not of this world, communicable to men by Jesus Christ, to raise them up to the “life of the coming age” or (as we normally say) life eternal, in which all our values are transvalued. What various other methods of operation on the human spirit Eternal Spirit has, by what other various approaches men may have contact with Jesus who is Life, and feed

CHRISTIANITY AND PSYCHOLOGY

upon the Bread which came down from heaven, it is not for us to limit or define. It is certain that for those of a certain temperament, brought up in a certain spiritual tradition, the symbolic, sacramental worships do serve in a way that nothing else can serve to feed the flame of this conviction and to mediate this saving Life. But to discuss the possible psychic channels by which this creative Spirit is appropriated does not in any way compromise our certainties. The Spirit is "there" independently of ourselves: our faith does not create the Life. But our faith goes out to welcome and receive it. That is, the "suggestions" come from God: it is for us to accept and appropriate them, to make them in the full sense "self-suggestions," worked into the texture of our lives.

Needless to say, I am not here putting forward any certain or assured conclusions. It is only a hint of a possible line of thought, and nobody who dislikes it need believe it. But of this I am sure, that such lines of thought are necessary. Regret it or not as we may, it is certainly useless to try to commend the Church's traditional practices to a generation impatient of tradition, unless we are ready to attempt to equate our own spiritual prescriptions with the current science of the human mind.

It may be worth while to quote here the testimony of a medical writer on psycho-analysis. "There is," he says, "no scientific reason why energy from an unseen psychic source may not be made available to energize an enfeebled will. These psycho-therapeutic effects [of reclaiming drunkards by the Salvation Army] may depend largely on the new

SUGGESTION AND PRAYER

spiritual orientation which is brought about.”¹ This seems to be close to the point we have been discussing.

I have purposely said very little in this chapter about specifically religious healing, because it has been discussed and explained so widely by people far more competent to deal with it. To pass from the level of the Guild of Health and the various methods of spiritual healing, whether by prayer, imposition of hands, or unction, to that of deep-breathing, and a magic formula seems like leaving pure mountain air to enter the stuffy glare of a cheapjack’s shop. Suggestion is bound to appear a far cruder method, as a moral and spiritual short-cut.

It is easy to say that one of these is magic, the other spiritual religion. But the whole attempt we are making is to refine the admittedly crude process of suggestion that it may be used in the service of religion. And it is not clear, if we look below the surface, that the machinery at work is really different in the two cases. The difference is in moral quality. I cannot but think that the “sacramental” means (anointing with oil after spiritual preparation) now so widely used for healing, and with such momentous results, contain this element of suggestion in them. If they awaken in the patient a vital faith in the power of a living God, and so unlock creative energies, it would seem that they mediate God’s healing power partly at any rate by that very means.

Nobody can escape from the conclusion that our Lord again and again reaffirmed “It is your faith

¹ Bousfield in *Psyche*, Oct. 1921, p. 118.

CHRISTIANITY AND PSYCHOLOGY

which has made you whole." Mr Pym has recently drawn attention¹ to the preliminary processes used by Him to arouse faith and expectancy in the patient, before the cure was wrought. He "took him aside from the multitude," He "stretched out His hand and touched him," "commanded him to be brought to Him," "touched his tongue with His saliva." All these are truly at one and the same time both "suggestive" and "sacramental" means of inspiring confidence in His own power, and the power of the Father in whose name He acted; though it was in the end, no doubt, His own presence which made belief in creative love possible, and purified the patient's imagination till the suggestion was fruitfully accepted. Indeed, one may guess that the connecting link between mere suggestion and the Christian healing may possibly be contained in this last clause, or in the Master's own phrase "prayer and fasting," that is to say, in that spiritual receptiveness on which we have been insisting all along.

To the famous question, "Why could not we cast him out"? two answers are recorded. "Because of your unbelief," is St Matthew's version of the more familiar answer in St Mark, "This kind goeth not out save by prayer and fasting."² It is quite likely that Our Lord said both. At any rate the first Evangelist half suggests that they are synonymous.

¹ *Op. cit.*, pp. 106-109.

² Mark ix. 28=Matt. xvii. 19. No doubt Matthew's διὰ τὴν δλιγοπιστλαν echoes Mark's τὸ εἰ δύνη; πάντα δύναται τῷ πιστεύοντι from the earlier part of the story, which Matthew omits perhaps because it seems derogatory to the Master. It is curious that Matthew, whose "tendency" is (in some ways) so nearly akin to the Epistle of St James, omits the reference to "prayer and fasting," which his ecclesiastical emphasis might naturally have led him to stress.

SUGGESTION AND PRAYER

And a rather significant fact is here worth noticing. It is the tendency of modern writers to describe moral facts in medical terms. They would rather speak of a complex than a sin. But Our Lord did precisely the opposite. He described medical facts in moral terms. "Thy sins be forgiven," He said to the paralytic : "Satan has bound her," He said of the woman's hæmorrhage. Possibly we have here the real distinction involved in specifically Christian healing. We noticed before, as the reader will remember, that often mere suggestion will not work without preliminary analysis. We also observed that the will to be made whole, the faith in the possibility of healing, may be inhibited by moral factors, some factors (that is to say) in the patient's character. Is it perhaps just here that the Christ avails when the patient is brought consciously into touch with Him ? It may be that He by His transforming influence makes possible the living faith as well as supplying the power for its satisfaction. There seems to be a much stronger *moral* quality in specifically Christian healing than in M. Coué's method of suggestion.

There is, of course, a great deal more concerned. There is the mysterious but undoubted fact of the efficacy of others' prayers in releasing spiritual forces. There is also the fact that healing may be effected without the patient's conscious co-operation, and none who has learnt the lesson of psychology will cast doubt on such possibilities. The whole question reaches out beyond our formulas into the eternal order. We are only just beginning to discover what new worlds may be opening to us. I am not attempting to imprison these swift-winged beneficent

CHRISTIANITY AND PSYCHOLOGY

forces from on high in the fetters of a psychological formula. We are only trying to find a middle term between what is stated as a matter of psychology, and what we can pray for as a matter of faith.

We should also add, before leaving this vast subject, that there seems no reason to doubt but many to hold that the sacrament of the Eucharist could be and is meant to be curative. Why else does the Church, retaining a reminiscence of the more unsophisticated Christian outlook, still use the phrase, "Preserve thy body and soul unto life eternal"? Why are the Bishops of the Church of England even now enjoined to "heal the sick" when they are invested with their commission? It appears that Christianity in the early days never drew the distinction which we draw between healing the sick body and healing the sick soul. More and more it is coming to seem probable that the two are fundamentally the same. "Whether is it easier, to say 'Thy sins be forgiven thee,' or to say 'Arise and walk'?"

Whenever Our Lord sent His disciples out to conduct what we should now call revival-missions, they were always invested with the double charge, "Proclaim the Gospel, and heal the sick." This tradition is firmly embedded in all the strata of the early records. It is also clear that the apostolic age, and the early centuries of the Church's life, so interpreted the Christian mission.¹ It may well be that the thought of the present day, both in Christian circles and outside them, is tending towards the

¹ The reader should study Harnack's chapter on Christ as "Saviour" in *Mission and Expansion of Christianity* (E.T.), Vol. I. Bk. II. Chap. ii.

SUGGESTION AND PRAYER

rediscovery of an integral part of the Gospel preached by Jesus—the healing power of a spiritual worship.

But we must now return from this digression—the inadequacy of which I fully realize—to complete what remains to be said about the confluence of suggestion with the life of prayer in the sphere of desire and will, and so of conduct. We said (p. 104) that the object of the life of prayer “is to keep the gate of the mind open to, and appropriate and make our own increasingly, all those suggestions which come from God.” We saw reason too for holding, as will be remembered, that a trained and disciplined habit of character enables us to exercise control over those suggestions which affect us. On the other hand, we saw reason to believe that a suggestion cannot be expelled by a mere decision of the will: it will only yield to a counter-suggestion.

Here we may surely see the real meaning of our Lord’s story about the empty house. You can only expel a wrong imagination by putting a right one in its place. You cannot drive out devils by Beelzebub—only a good suggestion can master a bad one. Otherwise, if you leave a vacant place, if you exorcise by other than positive methods, it comes back with “seven other devils more wicked than itself and the last state of the man is worse than the first.” All psychology reaffirms this teaching. It is only “the finger of God” that can cast out devils: positive good is the only cure for evil—and that is the heart of the Sermon on the Mount, and of the victory of redemptive love at Calvary and in the Resurrection.

CHRISTIANITY AND PSYCHOLOGY

Never use negative suggestions is the golden rule of the New Nancy School : and Our Lord's teaching and practice reinforce this. “*Veni Creator*,” Baudouin strikingly says, “is a more potent exorcism than *Retro Satanas*.” We can see Jesus, in the Temptation-story, always countering the satanic suggestions which would have weakened His life and spoiled His mission by the suggestion of God’s glorious will. “All these things” (said the voice) “I will give thee, if thou wilt fall down and worship me.” “Behind me, Satan” (He flashes back at once) : “it is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God.”

This leads to a practical point which may seem very small, but is shown by experience to be far-reaching. It is this—that the best protection against temptation is to give great prominence to Praise and Thanksgiving, in our evening prayers, perhaps, especially. It is possible to over-emphasize the practice of nightly self-examination, with highly deleterious effect. Within limits, it is probably indispensable. We cannot afford to resign our consciousness with any memory upon it which will close the door to the divine influence in the mysterious world which we enter in sleep. But it must be very strongly balanced by the prayer of contemplating God’s perfection. For if we start the day, or go to bed, with our minds chiefly occupied with the suggestion of our sin and weakness we are simply, in the slang-phrase, “asking for trouble.” We are inviting the assaults of evil. But if our minds were stored with the suggestion of the glory and the power of God from the moment we wake to the moment we fall asleep, we should be to a

SUGGESTION AND PRAYER

very large extent immunized against wrong suggestions, and evil desires would have no dominion over us. It is, as St Paul said, the shield of faith which quenches the fiery darts of the evil one.

The creed of some of us appears to be: "I do not believe that I can conquer evil. I know I am a coward and a liar, of vicious temper and uncontrolled passions." However lamentably true it may be as a description of one's character, it is a despairing creed to "face the world with"! The Christian creed is rather different: "*I believe in God, the Father Almighty*"—in an all-sovereign and creative love.

Always, therefore, in prayer, we should give time to this contemplation of the Divine perfectness—His power, His glory and the mightiness of His Kingdom. For we become what we love. Our strongest interests control our lives, so psychology assures us. And did not the Master say long ago that they who hunger and thirst for goodness shall be filled?

And such prayer, based on the certainty of God's power, and His availability, is the prayer which is effective in our lives. That we touch here again the machinery of suggestion and auto-suggestion we need not hesitate to recognize. Our Lord Himself, indeed, said as much when He stated that God's children, when they pray for things, should "*believe that ye have received them, and ye shall have them.*" Surely we have here the Christian statement of the uses of suggestion in the life of communion with the Father. In Jesus we can call the Eternal "Father": and we start our prayer with the

CHRISTIANITY AND PSYCHOLOGY

knowledge that we are speaking not to a sovereign but to a Father's love.

Enough has been said not to exhaust this question, but to indicate a line of approach to it which the reader can follow out for himself. Clearly it leaves us standing at the gateway of a new Universe of power and knowledge. It does not, as I have emphatically stated, relieve us of any moral effort, or tend to make religion cheap or easy. Rather it throws a more impressive emphasis on the need for purity of heart and all the purgation and discipline it implies. But it does reveal to us ways in which by a careful and reverent use of laws which God has allowed men to discover, we can make a better use of our own lives. It should help the Christian minister in his task of presenting every man perfect in Christ.

CHAPTER VI.

THE DANGER OF SUBJECTIVITY IN RELIGION.

THE movement of thought in the last half century has all been in the direction of emphasizing the subjective aspect of religion. More and more the appeal has tended to lie from "dogma" and creed and *a priori* reasoning, from any institutional authority, to the autonomy of Faith. We claim an indisputable sovereignty for a vital experience of God in the heart of the believer. "Religion comes first and Theology afterwards," is one of the passwords of this modern attitude. We no longer use the Bible as an armoury of theological proofs. Rather we see in it the developing record of the highest religious experience of men. We have come to see that the Christian creeds and doctrines are but attempts to explain to other people and to work into an intelligible account of things the profound experience of God in Christ which is the inheritance of the Christian Body. None claim now a mathematical accuracy for our traditional statements of belief. They are the best that could be done to convey the experience to others. They bar the way against "false" interpretations, such, that is, as would make impossible the experience of which the Church is conscious. But it is the experience which matters, and dogma is measured in terms of

CHRISTIANITY AND PSYCHOLOGY

its "prayer-value" as witnessed to by a hundred generations. The authority behind the doctrine, and the authority of the Church or Bible, is that of the gathered and stored experience of all those who have tried and found it true. The main currents of advancing religious thought, whatever their differences and divisions, may be said to agree upon this main position. The whole weight of the superstructure, whether simple or elaborate, has to be borne by religious experience. Dr Gore, for example, bases his entire *Reconstruction of Belief* on the religious experience of the Prophets.

Now it goes without saying that this tendency represents on the whole a substantial achievement in the cause of progress in religion. And it is, in fact, a return to the biblical attitude. All the highest flights of the Prophets are, as is everywhere recognized, a protest against externalism in religion. They demand an inward disposition in place of a formal creed or a ritual cult. They appeal back from the letter to the spirit. And since Jeremiah, with his superb insistence on the covenant graven in men's hearts, no other attitude is possible. Ezekiel saw the possibility of an inward mystical religion embodied and expressed in Institutionalism. But the Institution became petrified by its excessive emphasis on authority, till a prophet was regarded as a criminal (*Zech. xiii. 2, 3*). All that was most vital in Judaism during the Greek and Roman periods was kept alive by quietists and apocalypticists, and they came very largely from the villages of Galilee. It was from these circles that John the Baptist came with his revivalistic preaching. And

DANGER OF SUBJECTIVITY IN RELIGION

he, and the Greater than he who followed after, both stood in the direct line of the tradition of the Prophets. Our Lord endorsed and raised to its highest power their teaching about the inwardness of religion. “Neither in this mountain nor in Jerusalem : God is Spirit, and they that worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth.” “God’s Kingdom is within you.” Religion can never be the same again as if these sayings had been left unsaid. There can never be any turning back on them. And all effective movements of Reform, since the Church emerged from the Dark Ages, have been by way of attempts to regain that peak which the mists of external authority had hidden. Whatever their mistakes and crudeness, the power of all those strivings of the Spirit, often so catastrophic in their effect, which have been truly impulses towards the future, has lain in their victorious appeal to the ultimate facts of Christian experience and the presence of the Kingdom in men’s hearts. This is certainly the line of progress, and it is futile to try and go back upon it by any agitation for “more discipline.”

Making all allowance for an undeniable bias, Sabatier’s estimate is essentially true. “The conservatives of our time who turn to the thirteenth Century as to the golden age of authoritative faith make a strange mistake. . . . There was a genuine attempt at a religious revolution, which if it had succeeded would have ended in a universal priesthood. . . . The effort failed, and though later on the Revolution made us all kings, neither the thirteenth Century nor the Reformation was able to make us

CHRISTIANITY AND PSYCHOLOGY

all priests. . . . The thirteenth Century with juvenile ardour undertook this revolution, which has not yet reached its end.”¹ It is still, indeed, only beginning: but the emphasis of the last two generations, both in Theology and in the Sciences, is a definite pressure in the same direction. Contemporary Psychology reinforces it. In so far as this is so, it is all to the good.

At the same time it is well to recognize that there are really pressing dangers to spiritual and intellectual freedom involved in the tendencies of the present day. Just as “free thought” has become fettered thought incarcerated in mechanical categories, the slave of an orthodoxy long since obsolete, so our hardly-won spirit of freedom, with its costly conquest of religious “inwardness,” may easily prove a prison-house of the soul. For a really thorough-going subjectivism, such as seems to fascinate popular thought to-day, reduces the world to crass superstition. And the danger is, lest the interest in Psychology with which we are concerned in these lectures, so far from being a means to set men free—which is what it rightly claims as its own objective—should result in putting our minds and souls in irons. It will therefore, I hope, be not thought irrelevant, even in so summary a discussion, if we spend a short time in examining this danger which is, I believe, by no means imaginary.

The fashionable disparagement of Reason was bound, sooner or later, to bring its punishment. The reaction against mere intellectualism of an

¹ *St Francis of Assisi*, Introduction, p. xiii.

DANGER OF SUBJECTIVITY IN RELIGION

abstract and academic type was no doubt healthy and desirable. It was a protest against “bloodless categories” which desiccate the real, concrete life of reality as we meet it in our experience. It was right to insist that thought is the thought of thinkers, who are actual men with hopes and desires and passions ; that our thought is largely controlled by our interests ; and that—at any rate to start with—the thinker’s aim is practical rather than speculative. Psychology and Philosophy were right in relating thought more closely to will and feeling, as a function of living personalities encountering real objects in experience. That brings thought into contact with our purposes and the whole system of our moral life. But the reaction has swung out too far. To say that Reason cannot be considered in abstraction from the living man who reasons, is a very different thing indeed from saying that Reason is a slave and no longer master. That is equivalent to disowning all the conquests of the human mind. But in a good deal of recent Philosophy this conclusion is practically reached. It is what we will that matters, not what is true.

“Hoc volo, sic iubeo : stet pro ratione voluntas.”¹ But that is the whole philosophy of Prussianism : “Necessity knows no law.” As soon as you give up an objective faith, then the only way to argue any case is (in the end) by the argument of war.

And here the current researches in Psychology give support, from their side, to this “voluntarist” philosophy. They, too, tend to dethrone Reason

¹ “This is my will and so I order : let my will be your reason.”—*Juvenal.*

CHRISTIANITY AND PSYCHOLOGY

and to offer the crown to the "Unconscious," or at least to something which is infra-rational. The result was almost bound to be obscurantism. Truth may perish, the life-force must prevail. For though we have seen already and shall see further that there is both truth and value in this reaction, yet the alliance of these two powerful tendencies bids fair—unless resisted and guided rightly—to drive back the human spirit into a jungle of superstitious barbarism. It is, as it were, a raid by the ape and the tiger on the little clearing round the house of Mansoul.

Let us watch what is happening from closer quarters.

We can recognize gladly, and even insist upon, the high importance of Psychology to the student and teacher of Christianity, and still believe it is being driven to death in many spheres of thought beside our own, till the word has become almost an incantation. Religiously, this is producing strange results. For there is (except among professional Theologians who ignore the matter as one of no importance) an almost indecent interest at present in the Psychology of Religion. And here we seem to find ourselves back again in a long ago discredited situation where *experience* is equated with sheer *feeling*. It is hardly a caricature, indeed, to say that some of the weaker writing from this standpoint is really discussing "what God feels like." The limitation of all these treatises on the psychology of religious experience,¹ especially by the questionnaire method,

¹ I do not criticize Pratt's *Religious Consciousness*, which I think is quite the best book of its kind.

DANGER OF SUBJECTIVITY IN RELIGION

is that the tendency becomes more and more to identify religion with certain states of emotional excitement—that is, in the end, to make it a matter of temperament. What, then, of those who do not share this temperament? Is there no religious experience for them? This is all a recrudescence of the peril which beset the primitive Church of the first generation. Behind the books of the New Testament one can detect precisely the same tendency to identify the “Christian experience” with certain psychological phenomena which seem often to have accompanied it. But they are the accident and not the essence. Any religion can make people “speak with tongues.” It was St Paul and St John who saved the Church from so disastrous an equation. They said what needs to be said to-day with emphasis, that no intensity of feeling guarantees the value of an experience, or gives any real explanation of it. It is the *content* of experience, not its feeling tone, that matters. No one would think that to analyse the bath-water either explains or explains away the baby. But no more does the analysis of an experiencing mind explain or explain away what is experienced. Sooner or later we have got to ask whether the thing experienced is good, and whether the theory believed is *true*. We must “try the spirits, whether they be of God.” To stress religious experience is sound: but it leaves us in a swamp of morbid psychology unless we bring it all to the test of an objective standard of truth and value.

It would therefore seem a short-sighted piece of tactics when apologists seize upon pragmatist ways

CHRISTIANITY AND PSYCHOLOGY

of thinking as allies in defence of Christianity. For, after all, a religion abdicates any claim to men's spiritual allegiance if it shuns the glare of daylight reason and draws its blinds when the noon tide sun is up. It is not enough to say of a religion that it is comforting or stabilizing, or that it produces an intense experience. The question that must be faced is—Is IT TRUE? The pragmatic appeal—it is true because it wins souls—is, to say the least, a two-edged weapon. For there is no idea so fatuous but that it will succeed in “winning souls.” The question is, to what does it win them? And Christianity, at any rate, claims to be a true revelation of the character of God. Let us realize fearlessly that unless it *is* true, then every convert made is a new soul damned. The mere fact that I do, or do not, feel pleasant feelings, seems to be very largely irrelevant. What matters is whether my experience is indeed an experience of Reality. Thus, I suggest, the increasing recognition of the non-rational factors that are involved in our intellectual processes (to which we have already given attention) does not prove what it is sometimes held to prove. It does not mean that Truth is unimportant and that religion can grovel about in shadow. The corollary is surely just the opposite. We cannot live with the shadows in the cave. We demand with a more imperious necessity a really valid standard of Truth and Goodness by which we can appraise our experiences, which can be the goal of our will and our desire, and its light a trusty lantern unto our feet.

Thus our argument seems to be following round a

DANGER OF SUBJECTIVITY IN RELIGION

circle : but not every circular argument is fallacious. In the present case, the facts themselves demand it. For while, on the one hand, Dogma and Theology are interpretations of religion, presupposing "religious experience" as the subject-matter on which they work, yet it is also true that religious experience depends for its richness and validity upon a true and satisfying Theology. I would quote on this point some wise words of Dr Rashdall : "The notion that religious experience is always the same, and that different religious or doctrinal systems are merely different ways of expressing it, is one of the most absurd suppositions that a sane man ever maintained. It is refuted on every side by History, by Psychology, by. . . . Comparative Religion. . . . To a certain extent, no doubt, religious systems are theories invented to account for experiences which are more or less the same ; but it is quite equally true that the character of a religious experience is determined in great part by the intellectual theories which have previously been accepted, whether from conscious reflection or tradition, from instruction or environment, from emotional or temperamental attraction. . . . To suppose that a savage who has conceived an admiration for the character of Christ and worships a God whom he thinks of as like Christ, really had the same religious experience when he worshipped a Deity whose chief delight was human sacrifice or the smell of roast pig, is too ludicrous a supposition to be entertained by any one for whom 'religious experience' is more than something to be read about in works upon religious Philosophy."¹

¹ *The Idea of Atonement* (Bampton Lectures), Appendix I. pp. 472-3.

CHRISTIANITY AND PSYCHOLOGY

It is always the danger of institutional religion to underestimate the value of Truth, and to urge conformity to its Theology as the guarantee of obtaining its experience. But, while it probably is true that no one can appreciate a doctrine till he has at least to some extent entered into the experience which the doctrine attempts to express in terms of intellect, it is also true that an obsolete Theology, if pressed as a condition of membership, may positively prevent the would-be member from making the real experience his own. This applies with some force to the Church of England now. For it is certain that much of our Theology, and especially some of the language of the Prayer-book, is in hopeless conflict with the Christ-experience which the Church is in the world to mediate. It is no mere academic intellectualism which is crying now for a revised Theology. It is not the hobby of superior persons. It is rather a plea on behalf of the simple folk and of those thousands who stand outside the Institution and yet long to share in its experience. For to whatever extent the experience is conditioned by intellectual statements, it is clear that the thought of and attitude towards God which our Anglican worship, and some of our formulas, tend to impose upon the mind, do definitely debar the worshipper from the vital experience of God in Christ. Thus, those of us who most hate intellectualism, who value love and joy and peace above all the wisdom of the sages, and who long for a revival in this country of a simple, evangelical, Christian life of faith and fellowship and freedom, are bound to keep raising our voices for "re-statement." A

DANGER OF SUBJECTIVITY IN RELIGION

theological re-statement, adequate both to the knowledge of our day and to the vast simplicity of Jesus, is the indispensable preliminary to any real revival of Religion. The so-called "modernists" are modernists because of their reverence for the Catholic Faith, and their evangelical desire to propagate it. It is vital that men's religious beliefs be true : equally vital that they be few and simple.

On the other hand, the need for objective standards by which to criticise subjective "experiences," leads to a strong recognition of the necessity for the massive thrust and pressure of Institutionalism as the counter-stress to keep the soul's life balanced. Without some standard outside oneself, to which one's thoughts and acts can be referred, even ordinary duty becomes meaningless. And here the Catholic Church has certainly been truer to the deepest human needs than are some of the movements of contemporary thought. For it offers an objective standard by which to test the individual's faith. "There lies more doubt in honest faith" than the isolated individual, unless he be cast in a very heroic mould, would normally be able to overcome. At the same time, the individual's experience must submit to criticism and verification, if it would substantiate its claim to be true. The authority of the Christian Society—the tested experience of twenty centuries—corroborates the individual's faith and reinforces it in the hour of trial. It also supplies a standard of reference to correct its vagaries and eccentricities.

Institutionalism can also be seen from another point of view to be essential. No progress is con-

CHRISTIANITY AND PSYCHOLOGY

ceivable without a fixed goal towards which you progress. If we change "the object of our journey" every time we change our clothes, we are not very likely to get far on the way. Thus the idea, which is fashionable at present, of an immanent purpose or teleology guiding life in its advance, which has yet no fixed goal before it, would seem to be an idea which has no real meaning. No doubt the conception of an *elan vital*, a life-force ever self-creating, pressing forward to ever new achievements, which Jung has introduced into Psychology, has highly valuable points of contact with the Christian doctrine of the Holy Spirit. It may be found, later, to be the best way of stating it. But, as it stands, it is monstrously unsatisfying. An immanence undirected by transcendence, a purpose—but not of anything in particular—what a morass of confused thought is here! There is more concerned than a mere debating-point: it touches the whole function of the Church approached from the psychological point of view. For if, as is often said now, we *create* our "values," the developing life as it cuts into reality shaping out its values for itself—whatever it values having absolute worth, and interference by others being sacrilege—then the world is a moral lunatic asylum. This is individualism in hysteria. I cannot conceive that the Universe means anything unless values are rooted in its reality—ultimately in the Creative Mind that informs it—to exactly the same extent as truth. The whole art of living, and all advance in it, seems to be concerned with a growing understanding of the things that are "more excellent," and a growing

DANGER OF SUBJECTIVITY IN RELIGION

desire to live one's life in accordance with them. When a man thinks that certain things are good, it is (one would think) sufficiently obvious that he is either right or wrong about it. He is right in so far as the things by which he lives are indeed things which in themselves are good—if his standards correspond with truth. Christianity has always claimed to reveal, embodied in a personal life, God's standards of valuation. The Body of Christ exists to witness to them.

Now there is no doubt that the crass conservatism of the majority of our congregations is a symptom of something wrong in our Psychology. The herd instinct holds us like a vice and few have achieved emancipation from it. We have not so taught the religion of Christ as to give initiative and spontaneity and a passion for spiritual exploration. Clearly the social instinct must be operative: but the social-consciousness of the Christian Group should be a common enterprise and adventurousness. (The Psychology of the “old regulars,” as contrasted with that of the New Army officers, supplies an illuminating illustration.) The Institution—like any decent school—should be the training ground of spiritual freedom. But this is no argument for individualism: rather it tells in the opposite direction. For while, as a matter of educational method—moral or religious or political—it is infinitely more important that people should choose for themselves, and perhaps choose wrongly, than that others should make right decisions for them, yet there are things that they *ought* to believe and choose. The aim of education, plainly enough, is to lead the growing life out into freedom; and this is as true of the Church as it is

CHRISTIANITY AND PSYCHOLOGY

of the school. But we may endeavour with all our love and patience to help people to achieve their inner liberty, and yet realize that they will never win it except in so far as they manage to bring their lives into correspondence with the will of God and their minds into correspondence with His truth. Otherwise all is chaos and un-freedom. So that there are, as I cannot but think, some limits to the non-interference theory of education. I may hate repressive discipline of all kinds as the enemy of God : but I am bound at any rate to hope that people will realize that the end of life is what (as a Christian) I believe it is, and to try and lead them towards that realization as the condition of their liberty. It is impossible to teach without at least some fixed standards of what in life is true and good and desirable. All the more, then, if the blind lead the blind, the journey is likely to end in disaster. It is imperative that the ideals by which (whether consciously or unconsciously learnt) the child steers his life, should be *true*.

It would seem, then, that regarded from this standpoint, one of the functions of the Church as the school of spiritual freedom, is to keep clear and sharp before men's vision what is true and what is of absolute worth, and by all the resources of suggestion to inspire an experience of God in Christ—a fixed point which makes possible progress towards real liberty. When we know the truth, the truth sets us free. But truth, as we have emphasized already, is not attainable by "pure reason" : it is the thinker who attains to it. Thus, the suggestive force of the life of the Society witnessing to its

DANGER OF SUBJECTIVITY IN RELIGION

values in its conduct, is its main instrument of education. But without such a fixed standard of truth and goodness—kept ever fresh and clear by the play of criticism—it is hard to see how life can be sane or free. “Religious experience” remains a welter of undifferentiated feelings.

There is a notion, which we shall discuss later, that Christianity can be “explained” as a projection of unconscious motives, mainly sexual in origin, embodying themselves in a mythology which brings a sense of release in the inner struggle, as merely a set of imaginary symbolism side-by-side with the other mythologies. It is, therefore, fundamentally important to insist that the Christian experience is wholly and irrevocably conditioned by a life that was actually lived in history “in the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius Cæsar.” The religion of an Incarnation built and founded on historic fact is the guarantee of objectivity, of a standard of reference for our “experience.” All this, after all, is as old as Christianity. The tendency of the early second century, generally covered by the name Docetism, was, as St John said roundly, to “dissolve Jesus”¹ into a subjective phantom. By making light of the historic Person, and spiriting His humanity away, it would have lost its loyalty to fact and put a set of vaguely religious emotions in place of obedience to a personal Master. Thus, when the primitive Church in Asia Minor stood on the frontier of the western world, and held back all that tide of nebulous thought by insisting on her tremendous experience of God manifested in the flesh, she was really strik-

¹ 1 John iv. 3 (*Ἄνει*).

CHRISTIANITY AND PSYCHOLOGY

ing a victorious blow for intellectual and moral freedom. She knew that men are “called to liberty” and that this “new thought” meant spiritual serfdom. The tragedy is to reflect how, in later centuries, she turned her achievement into another tyranny. We cannot rightly accept on her authority statements about History or Science : they must abide the question of research. But it is, all the same, as the great expert in the values of the spiritual life (rooted in an actual Personality and an abiding Presence in her midst) that the Church makes possible for the individual the escape from mere self-limited subjectivism into the freedom of the City of God.

There are other points in which the current tendencies are a real danger to spiritual autonomy. To the emphasis on “religious experience” is added now a microscopic interest in the operations of the sub-conscious. The result is, often, that people give pride of place to whatever comes from the unconscious mind. But this is a retrospective step if there ever was one—a step right back as far as the Books of Samuel. It is in the primitive stages of religion that inspiration is identified with the hysterical and the abnormal. One would have supposed that we had outgrown that. But people to-day seem often inclined to estimate the importance of psychological phenomena—and not least those which occur in the sphere of religion—by their distance from the conscious Reason. Now, it may be true that the unconscious mind sometimes (even frequently) mediates higher truth and supernormal knowledge, as in some cases of “mediumship” and genius. And it seems to be certainly

DANGER OF SUBJECTIVITY IN RELIGION

true that in trance and dream doors are opened into the unseen which are barred against the mind in waking hours. But it needs to be said, in face of this crude tendency, that, because an idea comes from the unconscious, it is not therefore to be judged superior to the deliverances of deliberate Reason. It is not the channel through which it comes to us but its content and effect which really matters. The truth or falsity of a prophet's message is not decided by his excitability, but by the intrinsic value of what he says. "By their fruits ye shall know them," it was decided 2000 years ago. To go back on that is to find ourselves at Delphi, or the still cruder shrine of the witch-doctor. If anyone doubts this, let me quote a sentence from the leader of the Zürich School: "It seems to me that we might still make use in some way of [Christianity's] form of thought, and especially its great wisdom of life, which for two thousand years has been particularly efficacious. The stumbling-block is *the unhappy combination of religion and morality*. That must be overcome."¹ It would seem that Amos, Micah and their colleagues were more "inspired" than some of us, after all !

It is just in this blurring of the moral emphasis that one of the greatest dangers, I think, lies ; and I want to consider it lastly from this standpoint. I must not be taken to decry "religious experience." I am incapable of understanding how any Religion can rest, in the last resort, on any authority except experience. Nor can I conceive a Christianity whose central certainty builds on anything else than

¹ Jung, *Psychology of the Unconscious*, E.T., p. 45. (His italics.)

CHRISTIANITY AND PSYCHOLOGY

the personal companionship of Jesus. Religion that does not spring from a living experience appears to me to be merely ecclesiasticism.¹ But I am concerned to argue here for the widest possible interpretation of "experience" of God. It cannot be confined to states of feeling, or to any one form of impression or expression. The attempts to do so have always been disastrous. It is the weakness of William James and Starbuck that the experiences which they relate are, nearly always, thoroughly abnormal. To make them normative is fatal. And the drab, actual fact appears to be that the vast majority of religious people are strangers to religious experience in the sense of the *Varieties* altogether.

It is not unnecessary to emphasise this. For the prevalent tendency to introspection, to the cultivation or analysis of religious states of mind, is a gross misrepresentation of Christianity. Indeed, the atmosphere we breathe to-day in circles which are most occupied with religion, might almost be called fundamentally irreligious. It is all concerned with ourselves and not with God. But nothing could be easily imagined more remote from the outlook of our Lord. In His religion there is no trace of all this. The deep, calm certainty of His God-experience (and what else can religious experience validly mean?) has no touch of this feverish emotionalism. The nearest approach to a definition of the real nature of religion that can be gathered from His teaching is, that religion is *doing the will of God*. And this illuminates the point now before

¹ Pratt, *The Religious Consciousness*, Chap. XVI., has an excellent discussion of "the milder form of mystic experience."

DANGER OF SUBJECTIVITY IN RELIGION

us. For it seems to show that the emotional tone which in some cases, but by no means always, accompanies the activities of religion, is on the circumference, not at the centre. Some men, as they try to do the will of God in the circumstances which confront them, are conscious of a sense of exhilaration and joy and added strength and inward peace which literally passes understanding. Many are not : it is largely a matter of temperament and, within limits, of physical health. But "doing the will" is the essential thing. Some, as they offer their will to God in prayer, are overwhelmed by the consciousness of His Presence. Some are not : but their prayer is not less real. For the dedication of our wills, and perfect confidence in His Will as it is revealed in Jesus, is surely the heart of the Christian religion.

It is vital, I suggest, to recognize this. For to equate religion with states of feeling which for many men seem inaccessible, is to rob it of its catholicity. "Well, I don't feel like that, and so I suppose Religion is not for me," is the obvious and inevitable answer. And, further, the attempt to cultivate intense forms of emotional experience leads to a very severe moral danger. The whole history of religion shows how desperately narrow is the line which marks off religion from immorality when emotion is thus allowed the central place. It can be watched in the large-scale mass-emotions (helped by the psychology of crowds) where personality is handed over to the torrential semi-conscious forces undirected by intellect and will, with the wildest licence often following. And it can be watched in the individual life. No one can have been closely

CHRISTIANITY AND PSYCHOLOGY

in touch with young men who are temperamentally religious and not have, in his secret knowledge, a dreadful catalogue of lives which have been brought to the verge of moral shipwreck by this misleading attempt to "get religion." There are people who start from the equation of "experience" with certain intense forms of emotional tone, and then set themselves to stimulate and guarantee, for their own satisfaction, these undeniably delightful sensations. The result is a most unhealthy "introversion"—a turning inwards on the self—and frequently such a weakening of the will that their powers of moral resistance are undermined. Not infrequently it even stimulates the kindred emotions bound up with sexual passion. The step to moral disaster is a short one. As a rule these people belong to the well-marked type which may not unfairly be called the devotee. They live, as a general rule, in a world of feeling without much intellectual background or disciplined, purposive direction of life. They take to religion as ducks take to water.¹ And for them, religion of this subjective kind, so far from being a liberating force, is definitely a prison and a bondage. It holds them back from the conquest of their freedom. This is, no doubt, distressing enough to record, but it is a not unimportant illustration of the danger of this new subjectivism, to which we are here concerned to call attention. And behind these facts lies a psychological fallacy no less than a theological absurdity.

¹ Cf. Thurston, in Hugh Walpole's novel, *The Captives*: "I may be the greatest humbug out, but I'm religious. Religion is like 'aving a 'are lip—once you've got it you'll be bothered with it all your life."

DANGER OF SUBJECTIVITY IN RELIGION

Emotion, properly, is bound up with instinct, that is to say, with an impulse to an *action*. To each instinct corresponds its own emotion which normally accompanies its exercise, just as the satisfaction of a desire carries with it its own pleasure-tone. It is the commonplace of moralists that to live for pleasure leads to disillusionment. The reason is, that the pleasure is bound up with the satisfaction of desires. If we pursue certain objects of desire we experience pleasure in their realization. If we pursue "pleasure" in itself, apart from the object with the attainment of which the pleasurable sensation is bound up, we are living for a will o' the wisp. It is a psychological perversion.¹ And it is precisely the same in the case before us. The position of the religious dilettante, desiring the emotions of religion as an end in their own right apart from religious *actions*, is really comparable to that of the gourmet cultivating the food-pleasure and not the satisfaction of his hunger as the end of his activities. It is erecting into an end to aim at something which ought to accompany an action. And thus the psychic energy gets short-circuited. The condition of the soul must be unhealthy till its creative energies are unlocked and flowing freely towards appropriate ends.

But just this is the life of Christianity, with its insistence on the Kingdom of God and the call of Him who proclaims and offers it, as the goal and aim of the disciple's life.

¹ Cf. McDougall, *op. cit.*; Rashdall, *Theory of Good and Evil*, Vol. I. Book I. Chap. ii.

CHAPTER VII.

CHRISTIAN POWER AND RESOURCES.

A WELL-KNOWN American writer on the psychology of religion once said in a half-contemptuous epigram that it does not matter what we believe about God : the point of religion is to use Him. Needless to say, the attitude disclosed in this often-quoted saying is profoundly irreligious. It is quite a good description of primitive magic, the point of which is to force the gods to your will. But it does contain, like most violent paradoxes, a certain element of truth. It is true that what most of us want from God, and rightly expect from religion, is power to live well. We may even say, if we know what we are saying, that Christianity is will to power. For it is obvious enough that the secret of all power and effectiveness must lie in a right relationship to the creative and sustaining Will upon which we, and all living, depend. And it is true that one of the deepest needs of the generation in which we live is to find the secret springs of power. For the characteristic feature of our time is a certain pathetic moral impotence. There is no lack of good will and aspiration, but there is little effective driving-power. Very little, as we say, " gets done." And some, in despair of achieving their hopes and aims, are driven into a despairing violence, while others sink into the still more dangerous attitude of mere cynical

CHRISTIAN POWER AND RESOURCES

acquiescence, half frivolous and half fatalistic. Obviously, the limp benevolence of our own post-war age needs some new galvanic force to make it taut and vital and effective. And this should be the function of religion.

Christianity came into a world, disillusioned and despairing, listless, heart-weary, and morally ineffective, and presented itself to that world, in Harnack's phrase, as "the religion of the Spirit and Power."¹ It gave men new moral energy : it lifted them out of despair and gave them hope. It drew them out of listlessness and inertia into a life of faith and power and achievement. For the Spirit of God is life and power. "You shall receive *power*," said the Master, "after the Holy Spirit is come upon you" (Acts i. 8) : and the New Testament is very largely the picture of their reception of His endowment. The New Testament ought to be approached not as a text-book of Theology—there are several theologies in it all in the making—but as the record of tremendous things that happened in the lives of men and women. And the dominant note of it is certainly Power. Its crucial word, as has been so often said, is Dynamite (*δύναμις*)—mighty to the casting down of strongholds. From the naïve account of the great irruption of irresistible energies at Pentecost, when there came a sound like a rushing, mighty wind, through the records of the Apostolic age, with its miraculous achievements in the creation of a new moral order, and building up an organized social life as full of initiative as it was stable, which

¹ *Mission and Expansion*, English translation, Vol. I. Book II. Chap. v.

CHRISTIANITY AND PSYCHOLOGY

alone stood fast when civilization fell—it is the same story all the way. The triumph of Christianity in the Empire was the triumph of ethical achievement. For those generations, beyond any doubt, Christianity meant primarily life re-charged and redirected. It is hardly possible to exaggerate the impression left on us by the New Testament of lives that out of weakness were made strong, expressing themselves freely and creatively in triumphant and effective service.

It is the secret of this spontaneity, the inner dynamic of these unseen resources, that the world needs chiefly to recapture now. What has Christianity to say in practice of this “psychology of power”? ¹ For most of us live habitually (as W. James said) far below our maximum of energy. And if this be so, it must be because we fail to appreciate or to utilize to the full, those inexhaustible resources which Christianity puts at our disposal. Christianity supplies what Psychology declares we need if we are to realize our own possibilities. This, at least, we venture to claim here; and must attempt to vindicate the claim.

Now it has been shown by well-known experiments that fatigue and exhaustion are, if not entirely, at least largely, mental in their origin. They are certainly nervous rather than muscular, and there are many facts tending to show that mental causes play the chief part in the apparent weariness of the body. Under suggestion, a man’s normal grip on a “dynamometer” may be vastly increased or reduced

¹ The title of Dr Hadfield’s essay already quoted, with which the reader must at all costs make himself familiar.

CHRISTIAN POWER AND RESOURCES

to a minus quantity, and in similar experiments with an "ergo-graph," the result is known to be "favourably influenced by increased interest, pleasure, or other mental excitement."¹ From these and like facts, Hadfield draws the inference that "the limits of possibility in our daily lives are defined less by the body than by the mind, and . . . the resources of power are psychic rather than physical in character. . . . *The mind is exhausted before the body.*"² There are, indeed, unseen sources of psychic power, on which we can draw without limit and unfailingly. And the more energy we can draw from them, the more energy there is available. For God "gives not the Spirit by measure into us." But the condition of making fully ours this stream of inexhaustible power is that we shall spend it freely. The more we use, the more is given us. Freely we receive if we freely give. Perhaps we are wasting the resources of the Spirit by not using them sufficiently, or living our lives at sufficiently high pressure. "None is so healthy and fresh as he who gives freely of his strength and thereby liberates his impulses . . . into quickened activity."³

Put that into Christian terms, and what does it mean but that *Power can only be thought of in terms of service?* It is the first law of God's dealings with us that no gift is given us merely to enjoy: our "gifts" are ours in stewardship for service. So the power and resources of the Spirit are given us only if we are prepared to spend them. It is he who is

¹ C. S. Myers, *Introduction to Experimental Psychology*, Chap. VI. (on Mental Tests).

² *Op. cit.*, pp. 79-80.

³ Hadfield, *op. cit.*, p. 103.

CHRISTIANITY AND PSYCHOLOGY

willing to lose his life who finds it. Those who are pledged and sworn to God's service can rely upon His power to see them through.

Now, at this point, the teaching of Our Lord satisfies a psychological need. For the great repressor of energy is aimlessness. People who are, as we commonly say, "born tired" are those who have no conscious aim in service. All of us know that there is nothing which leaves one so entirely exhausted as doing nothing in particular. Non-expression, as Maurice Nicoll explains from a quite different point of view, is as bad for our mental and moral health, and as debilitating as repression. Spiritual listlessness (*accedie*) is the commonest mental ailment. And here our Lord comes and confronts people who, like the women at the Sepulchre, are sitting sadly beside their buried hopes, and calls them out to the growing point of life, to new contact with reality. We must not seek the living among the dead : " Go and tell My disciples." " Let the dead bury their dead, go thou and preach the Kingdom of God." " Come, follow Me." " Ye have not chosen Me, but I have chosen you . . . that you should go and bring forth fruit." He gives life power by giving it purpose : He challenges us with a Divine Vocation. Nobody who has once come into touch with Jesus can say any longer that life has no aim or meaning. But to know the immense task He expects of us is the highway to power and freedom.

But there are conditions. Our psychic no less than our physical life demands the rhythmic alternation of activity with quiet, of storing up power

CHRISTIAN POWER AND RESOURCES

with its expenditure. Nobody is always active, as Aristotle faithfully observed. Energy depends on rest. And it is a prime source of the moral powerlessness of the thin age in which we live that it allows so little time for quiet. The gospel of strenuous endeavour, so dear to the Anglo-Saxon temper, is indeed defeating its own object. We cannot be effectively strenuous because we have made a fetish of mere activity. We conceive religion, in the West, almost entirely in terms of doing things. Quietism is a term of reproach. There is something feverish and hectic about our religion as well as about our work. The clergy are like directors of large businesses, and people who are most concerned with religion are most conspicuously in a hurry. In the East they adopt a different standard of value. "What a holy man that must be," they say: "he never does anything." We can feel that this is a distorted perspective and yet be conscious that our western standards are equally distant from the truth. "How holy he is," we say: "he is always busy. He never has a minute to himself. Whenever I start talking to him about God he always flies off in the middle of our conversation to his next engagement. He never sits down to think or read a book." This is true too often, but obviously "all wrong." Religion is continually in danger of becoming a caricature of itself. The inner peace tends to get crowded out. And because it is so, our lives grow superficial, and our efforts starved and tired and ineffective. We must recover the power of concentration if we want to recover the secret of effectiveness.

CHRISTIANITY AND PSYCHOLOGY

The fact is, I suppose, that western society with its cult of possessing things and “getting things done,” has lost the contemplative attitude which must have its place in all full and worthy life. And this loss has impoverished Western Christianity. We allow small value to meditation and do not understand the prayer of contemplation. We regard that as an oddity of the “Mystics” who are prevented by their peculiar temperament from a normal life of religious activity. Yet life with no space left in it for contemplation is not life at all but western civilization. And as for the “Mystics,” it has been shown lately in Dom Butler’s brilliant book¹ that the Western Church has always held the opinion that the mystic vision of the contemplative is no monopoly of the “temperamental,” but the normal goal of the spiritual life for all Christians who will take it seriously.

We were led to emphasize in the previous chapter the danger of religious subjectivity. Religion, we emphasized, does not consist in the cultivation of certain mental states, but in active co-operation with God’s will. We must balance this now by an equally strong insistence on the need for collectedness and contemplation. Without these periods of meditation there can be no effectiveness in action. We are all too anxious to explain away Our Lord’s preference of Mary’s life to Martha’s.

But, given the recognition of this need, it is easy to see how the faith of Christianity opens to us sources of power here. It would seem to be true

¹ *Western Mysticism (1922)*, by Dom Cuthbert Butler, O.S.B., Abbot of Downside. (Constables.) This is a very good book indeed.

CHRISTIAN POWER AND RESOURCES

that meditation and the method of suggestion join hands. That self-collectedness or "introversion" about which the mystical writers say so much is the necessary preliminary of both. And as the soul draws in on its own centre, away from the distracting processes of spending and getting, becoming and ceasing to be, and tastes for a moment the life which is eternal, there it enters into communion with God, in whom all its desires and aspirations are perfectly fulfilled and guaranteed. In the silence where God is, our weaknesses and our problems fall away. It is probable that a far larger portion of the time allotted by each of us to prayer should be given to prayer of this more "suggestive" type. We should quietly affirm to ourselves all the endowments of whose need we are most conscious, ourselves simply confident and expectant in the light of the great certainty of God. This prayer of quiet is happily being revived, especially through the efforts of Canon Hepher and the Fellowship of Silence.

It may perhaps be that some who read this book will feel out of their depth in the last paragraph. It may seem to them unreal. It may seem to reflect too advanced a stage in the spiritual life—though if it were really so I could not discuss it—or to be concerned with an experience which they have not yet been able to authenticate. If this should be so, the same thing can be put in another way, in language which may sound more familiar. We have seen the importance of Imagination in the attainment of our highest capacities. "Every day I am getting better and better," according to the well-worn formula. I have merely been discussing this exer-

CHRISTIANITY AND PSYCHOLOGY

cise in its connexion with the life of prayer. Another way of stating the prayer of quiet with which we were dealing in the preceding paragraph would be to say that we ought to train ourselves in the use of a Christ-centred imagination. We should spend some moments every day, and so train ourselves to make it habitual, in contemplating our own lives and tasks in the light of the highest that we know, that is to say, in the light of the Christ-life.

Here again, no doubt, we shall often find ourselves faced by the limitations inherent in "Suggestion." A man may be full, I suppose, of a living faith in the sufficiency of Christ and yet not find that his faith gives him power. This may be due to some inner disharmony which inhibits his psychic life from functioning freely. Or there may be some complex like "inferiority" which partly at least discounts the effect in advance. We can only observe here what we have said before, that frequently some process of analysis or some fresh struggle for self-mastery is needed as the complement of suggestion. All the Mystics are at one in emphasizing that only after the stern and painful processes of "purgation" and self-discipline can real Contemplation be experienced. We should also repeat that the spiritual receptiveness by which a complete faith becomes possible, the liberation of personality from the chains and fetters of its imperfections, are themselves the gifts of God within the soul even as it struggles in its search for Him. "Thou wouldest not have been seeking for Me"—to quote Pascal's classic phrase—"if thou hadst not already found Me." We need not, I think, be afraid of this

CHRISTIAN POWER AND RESOURCES

“circle.” The facts themselves do not admit escape from it.

But, further, as energy depends on rest, so it is true that mental and moral power depend upon tranquillity and confidence. One could almost say without exaggeration that this is the “text” of Psycho-therapeutics. Confidence is the prime factor in personal power and moral freedom. And the first gift of Jesus to the troubled soul is confidence. Probably half the exhaustion and wear-and-tear of our scrambling modern life is due to worry. Think, then, how often and how refreshingly, as He spoke to the “toilers weighed down with their load,” our Lord begged them not to worry (*μὴ μεριμνᾶτε*). “Don’t worry about food: don’t worry about clothes: there is not a man here who by worrying can add six inches to his height. The Heavenly Father knows: trust Him: don’t worry.” But it is easy enough to tell a man distracted and tormented by anxiety that it is better for him not to worry. It is quite another thing to make that advice seem anything but cruelly ridiculous. And it is precisely that which Jesus does for us. If one could come for the first time to the Gospels and read the story, knowing nothing of it, it is probable that the first impression which would strike us as we follow Him through the Ministry would be that of His absolutely staggering optimism. You will never see Him quailing, however stupendous the difficulty before Him. Even in the darkest hour of disappointment, failure and betrayal, nothing could ever disturb His deep serenity. He moved about calmly, quietly, majesti-

CHRISTIANITY AND PSYCHOLOGY

cally, undaunted, undismayed, always certain of Himself and of the triumph of the cause committed to Him. And that was because of His massive certainty in the victoriousness of God's love and holiness. It was difficult for Him even to understand how people could waver and worry as they did. How is it, He would say, that you do not believe? How little you trust God! It was in His presence, under the magnetic influence of His Personality, that it became possible for people to recover faith in an all-sovereign holiness. Through all the ruin and wreck of human failure, He moves about with a joyous, radiant confidence, declaring that Satan had fallen like lightning from Heaven, certain of man's redemption and God's victory. Love believeth all things, hopeth all things: and He staked His life to prove that Love is true.

This is the gift that He offers our world to-day. There is little in our modern Christianity comparable to that massive faith of His. And the moral paralysis of the world about us is very largely traceable to this fact. The world we live in is politically, socially and economically, because spiritually, bankrupt. It cannot recover till it recovers confidence: it has no psychological driving-power. If we are weak, it is because, fundamentally, we do not believe in God as Jesus did. And this is as true, as a broad generalization, of those within the Church as of those without. We cannot expect to recover hope or power till from Jesus we have recovered faith. We must move out from our desolating subjectivism, trusting ourselves to the guidance of His leading, towards His triumphant and objective certainty. It

CHRISTIAN POWER AND RESOURCES

is just the Lord Himself who makes that possible—showing us God in the language of man's life. “When we come out as disciples into the presence of Jesus Christ, prepared to take Him as more modern than any teacher of to-day, we enter a world of new discovery of God and Man immeasurably more wonderful and beautiful than we have ever known.”¹

Let us examine this twofold confidence, of faith in human possibilities based on faith in God's resources, as Jesus offers it to our modern world.

The antithesis of faith is fear : and it is remarkable how many of the nervous diseases of our tired age are described by the generic name of “phobias.” Indeed, it has been said authoritatively that if we could banish fear from our modern life, we should free men from half their mental ills. Fear, too, in one form or another, is at the bottom of half men's moral weakness. Much of the force of temptation is added to it by the fact that we are afraid of it. The adolescent in particular, confronted with forces that he does not understand, often feels a real sense of terror as he faces these unknown mysterious dangers, which puts him from the first at a disadvantage. Thus to explain to him the operation of the forces which are surging through him, to translate him “out of darkness into light,” is one of the best ways of giving him moral courage. But far and wide beyond this special case there are men and women in plenty whose lives are fettered and their moral energies imprisoned by an undefined but haunting fear. They are afraid of life and afraid of death : they are even half afraid of themselves.

¹ Cairns in *The Army and Religion*, p. 443.

CHRISTIANITY AND PSYCHOLOGY

They believe that they are held in the grip of some mysterious and ruthless forces, against which man asserts himself in vain :

“ Like flies to wanton boys are we to the gods
They kill us for their sport.”

At the heart of all this fear there is scepticism about the character of God, and the real meaning of the universe.

So it was with the world into which Jesus came. It was, as one sees from the secular literature as well as the background of the New Testament, a world of dim superstitions, demon-haunted, a twilight of the gods. People believed in unclean and malign spirits constantly waiting to seize upon and ruin them. The terror of this belief in “ possession ” seems often to have produced insanity, sometimes in a violent, homicidal form (Mark iv. 1-20). He brought the light of God into this darkness. “ Have courage : don’t be afraid,” He said. He enabled them to believe in the God He shows to us, and thus by delivering them from their fears, He delivered them also in that act from their “ demons.”

It is in the spirit of this revelation that the beautiful old legend crystallized, which tells how on the evening of the Nativity a Greek shipmaster steering his trading vessel through the crowded channels of the Cyclades heard a great cry at sunset tearing the sky, which proclaimed “ Pan is dead.”¹ The old religion of nature-worship, with its caprice and its uncertainty, its cruelty and incalculable terrors, was now made impossible for ever. Perfect

¹ Cf. the famous verses beginning “ The lonely mountains o’er,” in Milton’s *Nativity Ode*.

CHRISTIAN POWER AND RESOURCES

love had cast out fear. For Christianity lives in a daylight world. We are not slaves, dwelling underground in a world where we “know not what our lord doeth.” Minds enlightened by Greek philosophy had learnt that truth is our friend.¹ Jesus, who called Himself the Truth, has also called Himself our Friend. Mr Bevan has recently shown in a brilliant chapter what a sense of terror—a terror of death, and the unknown destinies of the astral world-rulers—dogged the world of Hellenistic culture during the first two centuries of the Empire. The demand for escape, release, redemption, chiefly conceived as deliverance from this fear, was met by a strange chaotic syncretism of high religion with magical occultism. And the Gospel, he says, “must have seemed such a simplification. Instead of the enormous apparatus of mystical words and ceremonial practices, to believe that in order to conquer all possible terrors of the Unknown, the whole range of ghostly enemies, one needed only to know Jesus.”² The meaning of Life had been made manifest in Him: men’s eyes had seen it, and their hands had handled it. God had shown Himself to men in His own reality, shining in the face of Jesus Christ. He had given them, and gives us still in our equally bewildered modern age, confidence towards God.

An interesting corroboration comes to us from the Mission-field to-day. Let me quote from Dr Schweitzer’s brilliant book.³ “Christianity is for

¹ Inge in *The Legacy of Greece*, p. 85.

² *Hellenism and Christianity*, p. 87.

³ Schweitzer, *On the Edge of the Primeval Forest*, pp. 154-155.

CHRISTIANITY AND PSYCHOLOGY

him ” [the negro] “ the light that shines amid the darkness of his fears. It assures him that he is ~~not~~ in the power of native spirits, ancestral spirits or fetishes, and that no human being has any sinister power over another, since the will of God really controls everything that goes on in the world.

“ I lay in cruel bondage,
Thou cam’st and mad’st me free.”

These words of Paul Gerhardt’s Advent Hymn express better than any others what Christianity means for primitive man. Redemption through Jesus is experienced by him as a twofold liberation : his view of the world is purged of the previously dominant element of fear, and it becomes ethical instead of unethical.”

That faith we simply cannot take for granted. We may not be so “superstitious” as the earlier ages, but Faith is not less difficult for us. We are haunted by the great misgiving—in a world that is so evil, how can we still believe that God is good ? I hold that none but Christ can make this possible. He taught, say the records, with authority, needing no adventitious aids. He had the witness in Himself. The irresistible conviction of the truth of God was in His life, in that compelling love and holiness, that life of dedicated service, by which He declared Himself “Master and Lord.” He went about on earth, says one, doing good. And another adds, “And we beheld His glory, glory as of an only-begotten from the Father.” More and more it was, as a matter of history, the experience of those who came under His spell that in seeing Him they had seen the Father.

CHRISTIAN POWER AND RESOURCES

The experience repeats itself still. Christ or Chaos is the alternative which still presents itself to the seeker for truth. Everyone longs to believe that love is true, but only in Him is it possible to believe it. And His death and resurrection vindicate the faith which we dare to take from the days of His flesh, that in Him the Eternal has drawn near to man and manifested Love's supremacy. When we see Jesus on the cross, wrestling in the dark alone with all the violent realities of life, love and holiness and faith challenging all the forces of hate and selfishness, apparently broken by them and yet victorious—then it is possible to believe in God. We know Him, then, in whom we have believed ; and thus we have what the New Testament, keenly aware by its Jewish ancestry of the difficulty of approach to God, calls “access with boldness” unto the Father. There is no fear in love.

But no less does the Master give us confidence in ourselves, in Man, in the human material. Christianity is the only religion which believes in ordinary people. It believes in them because Jesus did. It was His teaching that those who believe in goodness not only find it, they create it. If we forgive, it is forgiven us : if we give, it is given to us again : if our eye is generous and our judgment charitable, even so men show themselves to us. The standards by which we measure others are those by which others measure us. We must lend, therefore, “despairing of no one,” refusing to repay injury for injury, overcoming evil by good. And what He taught, His whole life illustrated. There was never one who penetrated so relentlessly behind all sham

CHRISTIANITY AND PSYCHOLOGY

and cant and insincerity into the inner secrets of the heart. There was never one who knew so tragically the depth of evil of which man is capable. But never has there been one in history who believed so profoundly and unswervingly in the radical goodness of human nature and its immeasurable capacities. As the supreme Believer in God, He was also the supreme Believer in man. He trusted men so much that He made them what they had it in them to become. So He made unprecedented demands and enabled people to rise to the height of them. To very ordinary people, very limited and rather stupid (for so the disciples confess themselves to have been), He said quite calmly, meaning it, every syllable, "You are therefore to be perfect, even as the Father in Heaven is perfect." And, indeed, the history of Christianity is the story of how all down the centuries He has drawn incredible power and goodness out of commonplace men and women.

We have quoted already Baudouin's sweeping dictum that a man is the slave of a bad habit so long as he thinks he is, and no longer. The most corroding of all evil habits is to grow habituated to the second-rate. There is no habit more emasculating in its effect on the moral life than this. Jesus makes it possible to know that the highest level is attainable—to believe in Man as God intended him.

Most of the trouble of to-day is traceable to a real scepticism about the capacity of human nature. We say that there are very few great men, that the average run of men have small capacities, that "human nature is human nature," and that it is the

CHRISTIAN POWER AND RESOURCES

part of wisdom not to attempt to get more than one can get out of very mediocre material. But this makes liberty impossible and higher education a waste of time. It is atheism expressed in practical politics. And with this fundamental apostasy Christianity can never come to terms. We must believe in men as much as Jesus did: He believed in them enough to die for them. Take a man when he is at his worst, when he has disgraced himself completely, and you despair about his reclamation, ask yourself, How much good is there in him? Christ on Calvary is God's answer,—“That he was worth to God whose wheel the pitcher shaped.” Christianity, then, starts, in its outlook on man's possibilities, not with a problem but with a solution. And this double confidence, in God and Man, gives us confidence in victory. That is always the decisive factor. “*Une bataille*” (as Foch was reported to say in the dark days of 1918) “ne se perd pas matériellement.” It is all a matter of *morale*. A joyous army is a victorious army. We can enter, therefore, now, with fresh understanding into some of Our Lord's more enigmatic sayings which the commentaries would call “apocalyptic.” At the last hour before sentence was passed upon Him, standing helpless and alone before the priest, His work a tragic failure, He looked out across the darkness to the victory that must surely be and proclaimed its spiritual certainty: “From this time onward there shall be the Son of Man seated on the right hand of power and coming on the clouds of Heaven.” That is some measure of His imperial mind.

CHRISTIANITY AND PSYCHOLOGY

So, in true spiritual descent from Him, in the darkest hour of the Church's history, when Domitian sat in Augustus's seat, and the big battalions were organized to crush out the Christian Brotherhood, and it seemed that the Kingdom could never dawn on earth, an old man bound in chains in a fever-haunted quarry on a malarial island of the Archipelago looked up and made his earth-shattering proclamation : "I saw the City of God, New Jerusalem, coming down out of Heaven from God." Here is the victory that overcomes the world—not by defeating the world but by triumphing in it.

The world of religion and politics to-day reminds one of Jeremiah's haunting phrase—"broken cisterns that can hold no water."¹ The work of the Church as the instrument of the Spirit is to fill them with power and effective energy. And those who have come under the influence of Jesus will see this world not as a blank problem but as the opportunity for God's resourcefulness. "I will give of the water of life freely." For to be in touch with Jesus, and to have the right to draw upon His Spirit, is to be in touch with infinite resources. We have only to take and spend them and take more. "The works that I do," He said, "*shall ye do also, and greater works than these shall ye do,* because I go unto the Father," that is, Because I am with you in spiritual power and presence always. We tap here the deepest experiences of the Christian believer, where no language can be adequate to express the great fact that can only be discovered by those who will

¹ Jeremiah xi. 13.

CHRISTIAN POWER AND RESOURCES

make the venture for themselves. We can but echo St Paul, in his attempt, when he took words and strained them till they broke, forcing them to say what was in his heart: "All things are yours, things present, things to come, life and death, all are yours, and ye are Christ's and Christ is God's" (1 Cor. iii. 22).

CHAPTER VIII.

PSYCHOLOGY AND THEOLOGY.

So far, we have been mainly occupied with the practical treatment of our subject. We have tried to discuss the practical application of the new psychological discoveries to the development of the Christian life. It has been our aim to suggest that so far from being (as is suspected in many Christian quarters) antagonistic to the Christian faith, Psychology is in many of its aspects more akin to a "re-publication" from the scientific standpoint of facts that were known and lessons that were taught, and cures that were achieved "by the finger of God" twenty centuries ago in Galilee. But there are urgent speculative problems which we cannot afford to leave wholly out of sight; and I want to devote the closing lectures to them.

It is impossible to read any recent psychological literature without being faced by extremely disturbing questions in ethics, metaphysics and theology. Indeed, it may be that many of these books are more important and repaying for the sake of the questions they are bound to raise in the mind of any student of Theology than for the positive results that they achieve. I am convinced that it is superficial, and ultimately very bad philosophy, to regard Psychology in its modern form as in any way an

PSYCHOLOGY AND THEOLOGY

effective menace to the Christian interpretation of the Universe. I am not at all sure, on the other hand, that it will be found to be compatible with the form in which that has traditionally been stated. If not, and supposing that the hypotheses on which Psychology is working now are tested and verified and pronounced adequate, then the form will have to be revised and recast in a more psychological mould—as Archbishop Temple prophesied so long ago as 1857.¹ Dr McDougall claims that he is laying the indispensable foundation for “any future” philosophy of History.² And it is a popular demand at present that traditional Theology should be restated in terms of the thought and language ready to hand in the current theories of Psychology. How far can we find here our new vocabulary for a twentieth-century Theology?

It would seem that the researches of psychologists are not yet sufficiently co-ordinated, nor their conclusions sufficiently established to make any definite statement possible. Yet one can see that some traditional dogmas will have to be fairly drastically rehandled if the truth they contain is to be made significant. Psychology *has* certainly forced us to question a good many venerable views in ethics : and if so, the Theology of the Atonement may very likely have new light thrown upon it. Accepted ideas of Guilt and Responsibility³ (*i.e.* in theological language Sin) will have to be considerably revised ; and Forgiveness and its possibilities is one

¹ He said we must have a new Theology “based on Psychology instead of logic. . . . Nothing can prevent it.” Quoted in *Foundations*, p. 226.

² *The Group Mind*, pp. 99-100.

³ See below, Chap. IX., pp. 188 ff.

CHRISTIANITY AND PSYCHOLOGY

of the facts on which Psychology is throwing already a searchlight of new meanings. "Salvation by faith" and "salvation by works" have ceased to be merely theological formulas: they are matters of scientific observation. The psychology of instinct and "release" is certainly going to help us greatly here. Moreover, many of our traditional statements rest upon a conception of Personality—whether human or divine—which modern psychology has made impossible, and sooner or later will have to be reformulated. Possibly, too, as the Bishop of Manchester has been frequently suggesting lately, the crucial problem of Christology, that is, of our Lord's divine-human Nature, may find some line leading towards the truth in psychological investigations.

These questions are too far-reaching and too delicate to be discussed in the course of half a chapter. They require a vast amount of research, and far more time and thought than is now available. I hope to be able to tackle them later on. Here I confine myself to the broader issue. And it is, I think, undeniably the case that the first sensation of the student when introduced to the New Psychology is that the ground is shaking beneath his feet. A great many of his rough-and-ready theories, and some of his fundamental beliefs and concepts, seem to be undermined and tottering. If mind and will are not what he thought they are; if freedom and guilt and moral responsibility are less clear-cut ideas than he had supposed; if even Personality itself is so nebulous and elusive a conception; some of his strongest positions begin to give way. He feels the

PSYCHOLOGY AND THEOLOGY

subject must be dangerous and likely to subvert the Christian faith. May it not even cast doubt in the end on the very reality of God? It is to this main problem that I wish to devote this and the following lecture.

But the thoughtful reader is not alone in this theological bewilderment. Psychology has become popularized more rapidly than any science previously. Enormous numbers of people are now familiar with some of the more popular text-books, at first hand or through the medium of the Press. And there is in consequence a vague impression which would appear to be rapidly gaining ground that the new psychological discoveries have somehow put Christianity out of date. And some of the most important current books take for granted as needing no discussion that men will now explain as auto-suggestion or the projection of the social or other instincts what our unenlightened ancestors called God.

This is a challenge we cannot afford to shirk. The really urgent problem of to-day, as Kirsopp Lake foretold in 1914¹ is

“concerned with the question, What is religion? And the opposing propositions will be (1) that religion is the communion of man in the sphere of subliminal consciousness with some other being higher than himself, and (2) that it is the communion of man with his own subliminal consciousness which he does not recognize as his own,

¹ *The Earlier Epistles of St Paul*, pp. 251, 252.

CHRISTIANITY AND PSYCHOLOGY

but hypostatizes as someone exterior to himself."

If the second of these alternatives is true, it is merely waste of time to go on discussing the bearing of the New Psychology on the interpretations of Theology. There will be no more Theology to discuss. Even the equable and broad-minded Theism of our post-war speculations would probably still be prepared to admit, if challenged, that Theology means "thinking about God." However pleasant and tonic an exercise self-communion with oneself may be—and all of us know, within limits, that it is so—emphatically it just is not religion as it is known to any religious man. Our Lord once told a story about a Pharisee who mistook self-communing for prayer: "The Pharisee stood and prayed with himself" (St Luke xviii. 11). We are not encouraged to follow his example. This theory means that God is a mistake.

Let there be no obscuring of the issue. If this theory is true (*i.e.* if God is only a "projection," of your own consciousness or that of your group), it isn't merely a question of defending the minutiae of Christian orthodoxy. It is a question of whether any longer one can honestly maintain the possibility of any real religion whatsoever.

Dr Pratt has put this with refreshing candour: "That meditation may have excellent subjective effects is not to be denied, but no one with any knowledge of the psychology of religion will claim for it an influence equal to that which results from the earnest prayer of the man with faith. . . . For

PSYCHOLOGY AND THEOLOGY

since the subjective value of prayer is chiefly due to the belief that prayer has values which are *not* subjective, it will with most persons evaporate altogether once they learn that it is *all* subjective. Hence, if it be true both that the subjective value of prayer is very great, and also that this is the only value which prayer possesses, this latter fact should be assiduously kept secret. . . . No, if the subjective value of prayer be all the value it has, we wise psychologists of religion had best keep the fact to ourselves; otherwise the game will soon be up and we shall have no religion left to psychologize about. We shall have killed the goose that laid our golden egg.”¹

Now, as we seek to face up to this question, the lesson of the eighteen-fifties is full of warning and encouragement. The tragic and quite needless conflict between Science and Theology which has left both combatants still scarred and mutilated arose from a closely parallel situation. Religion and Science both behaved illegally. Each violated the frontier of the other. In the excitement and intoxication of the new biological discoveries, Science invaded the territory of Theology. “Evolution” was not, of course, discovered then; the theory is as old as the Greek thinkers. But the work of Darwin brought it prominently before the mind of the general public, and his special theory of natural selection, throwing an emphasis (which more recent work in this field tends to regard as exaggerated) on environment as the decisive factor, made the step to “materialism” easy. The demonstra-

¹Pratt, *The Religious Consciousness*, pp. 335-336.

CHRISTIANITY AND PSYCHOLOGY

tion of the continuity of human life with our pre-human ancestry was enough to turn the head of a generation brought up to regard the old creation-legends as literal statements of scientific fact. It did so. But it turned them the wrong way round. Men hastened to assure Theology that the so-called special creation theory was no longer borne out by the facts. That was quite true : Paley was obsolete. But they also leapt to the really insane conclusion that there was now no room left in the Universe for any mind or will or conscious purpose. Theology was forced to retaliate, and scored a bull's-eye—on the wrong target. Instead of adjusting itself to the new facts, which would have been the right defensive movement by taking an offensive on its own, it simply declared with monotonous iteration that the new facts were not true. The struggle raged round issues which to us seem strangely antiquated and unreal : indeed, we can see now that this bitter war was one without any genuine *casus belli*. And both the combatants have been left the poorer. Science, having banished consciousness, was left with a barren mechanistic theory which soon proved useless even for its own business, and is now almost universally discarded. Theology, by refusing to face new facts, identified itself with obscurantism, and lost its hold on the educated world. But each of them would have vastly enriched the other if each had not usurped the other's functions. Science claimed to *interpret* the facts of experience—which is the proper function of Philosophy : Theology tried to control or conceal facts which it is the task of Science to discover. This tragedy must not be repeated now.

PSYCHOLOGY AND THEOLOGY

The advance of man's knowledge of the physical world between the fifteenth and seventeenth centuries was largely due to a clear delimitation of the different spheres and provinces of study. Magnificent as everyone must feel the attempt of Scholasticism to have been—the attempt to control in the interests of Theology all the provinces of the human mind—it proved in the end a fatal obstacle to any progress in clear thinking. Science had to break free of Theology, claiming autonomy for its own researches. "Final causes" had to be ignored.¹ Only so could Science become scientific and discover and verify the actual facts. But Science ceases to be scientific the moment it passes outside its own province, and seeks to give *explanations* of its facts. Then it is actually impeding knowledge, and attempting to impose on others the tyranny from which it had freed itself.

There are thus two entirely distinct questions which must never be allowed to become confused. The first is, *How* as a matter of fact do things happen? That is the business of Science to discover. The second is, *Why* do things happen so? That is the business of Philosophy (or Theology) to try to explain. All advance in knowledge, and all clear thinking, depend on keeping these two inquiries separate. Much of the trouble at the present time seems to be due to their having become confused.

The heady and premature dogmatism with which the science of the physical world rushed to the destruction of religion is closely paralleled at the present day. So soon as Science, within certain

¹ Bacon, *Novum Organum*, I. §§ 65, 89.

CHRISTIANITY AND PSYCHOLOGY

limits, began to discover how the world was made, it declared that therefore God did not make it.. It was a wholly illogical conclusion. But psychology, in its new enthusiasm, is in danger of repeating that mistake. Knowing, again within certain narrow limits, the laws of the working of the human mind, it is tempted to say that therefore God did not make them. Certain modern psychologists, indeed, claim to have superseded God exactly as did the physical sciences. So Freud preposterously claims that what has been hitherto called metaphysics must in future be known as "metapsychology."¹ He has explained away the "myth of God." One seems to have heard the same claim made before, by the cruder forms of "Comparative Religion." There was, at one time, a curious argument that, because everywhere, in all levels of culture, mankind is found to have been religious, and all religions show at first appearance certain superficial resemblances, therefore all religion is untrue. There was also the era of the "solar-myth" now so decisively discredited, which was used to intimidate very nervous Christians. More recent researches have opened up the secondary, underground religions of the earlier Mediterranean culture over which the "Olympian" worships were imposed. We know a good deal about "mystery-religions" in the Græco-Oriental world, and their supposed points of contact with Christianity are sometimes exploited to discredit the latter. There is a school which seeks to "explain" Christianity as a sort of precipitate formed by the

¹ *Psychopathology of Everyday Life* (E.T.), p. 309. But what is the word supposed to mean?

PSYCHOLOGY AND THEOLOGY

fusion of Judaism with these old-world faiths. The attempt, I think, is quite unsuccessful, and I doubt if critical investigation even concedes a very far-reaching influence on Christianity to the mystery-cults. But, even if we go the whole length in regarding the "catholic" form of Christianity as the inheritor of these ancient worships, that would not in itself cast any doubt on the validity of the experience which all religions seek to mediate. Religion, says Lake, lives by the death of religions : and obviously the findings of Anthropology and Comparative Religion have modified the pre-scientific attitude to the "gods of the heathen" as though they were "but idols." But to recognize how religions have developed does not in itself demonstrate their falsity. The religious experience of the human race is a permanent factor in all its history, and all History must take account of it. So much, we thought, was everywhere conceded.

But psychology has opened a new approach to the business of eliminating God. It attaches, as any science is bound to do which studies the facts of human consciousness, fundamental importance to religion. It does not question its subjective value : but some of its exponents argue that religion has no other value, that there is nothing "at the other end." So they have, in effect, revived the old idea of the non-religious origin of religion to disprove the existence of the God it worships. Hunger and lust, said the old "materialism," sufficiently explain all man's activities. Certain psychologists take this very seriously, and regard the whole apparatus of Religion as a projection into symbolic form of the primary

CHRISTIANITY AND PSYCHOLOGY

instinctive impulses. It is easy to make great play with the sex-instinct, and it is a fashionable theory now that the religions of men are "eroto-genetic," that is, sexual in their origin. So, with characteristic thoroughness, Freud and Jung are anxious to assure us. All the creeds and cultures of Religion in their bewilderingly varied forms, can be traced to a common source and spring. They are all symbolic phantasy-images of the developing sex-life of the race. The most elaborate treatment of this matter with which I am personally acquainted is in Jung's *Psychology of the Unconscious*. There, all religion, all poetry and folklore, all the myths of the dying Saviour-gods (including, of course, the Christian version of them) all the imagery of art and poetry from the "Oedipus" down to Paul Verlaine, are pressed into the service of this theory. They are symbolic fantasies of life passing through its storms to independence : and, like the primrose, *they are nothing more*. This theory, as a matter of psychology, lays itself open (I think) to destructive criticism. It has been examined in a brilliant Essay by the late Dr Rivers, published after his lamented death.¹ Rivers' work was tending emphatically to discredit the basis on which much popular Anthropology rests. He establishes that the similarities found in religion and social custom in such widely scattered geographical areas, are *not* due, as was commonly assumed, to the uniformity of

¹ "The Aims of Ethnology" in *Psyche*, Oct. 22, pp. 118-132. This Essay is to appear in *Psychology and Ethnology*. Dr Elliott-Smith's article, in the same number, forecasts his own book, *The Psychology of Myths*. Unfortunately neither of these books have been published at the time of my going to press.

PSYCHOLOGY AND THEOLOGY

the constitution of the human mind, so that, "given similar conditions . . . the same modes of thought and behaviour come into existence independently." They are almost certainly due to transmission from some common centre of origin. If so, a great deal of loose, popular thought about "evolution," "spontaneous generation" and the like, in connexion with religious origins, and especially the use that Freud has made of them, are at least dangerously discredited. Indeed, one of Rivers' coadjutors, Professor Elliott-Smith, roundly asserts that Freud and Jung have no ground left to stand upon. "The new teaching in ethnology," he claims, in introducing Rivers' article, "destroys the foundation of the belief in the reality of 'typical symbols' and brings to the ground the fantastic speculations built upon it by Freud and Jung."¹

It sounds convincing : but we must wait developments. Meanwhile, I am only concerned here to point out the tendency of biological psychology to explain away the "myth of God" as a rationalization of the instincts.

The emphasis is not always on the sex-life. A similar and, at first sight, more plausible theory, has been woven round the social instinct. Whether in the less sophisticated form of the ordinary writers on Social Psychology, or in the more elaborate hypotheses of the "Group-theory" of religion associated with the work of Durkheim,² the suggestion is that the Deity men worship is but the spirit

¹ *Psyche*, ib., p. 115.

² This has been critically examined by Professor Webb in his *Group Theories of Religion*. There was a good paper on the eroto-genetic theory by Mr Thouless in *Psyche*, Oct. 1921.

CHRISTIANITY AND PSYCHOLOGY

of their social group externalized as a Power who claims their loyalty. These different theories are all agreed in this, that, by an examination of religion, they seek to eliminate its Object. Our business, at present, is not to examine in detail or try to refute these various hypotheses, but to discuss as a matter of logical method the procedure by which they arrive at their conclusions. It is not very difficult to show that they argue by fallacious reasoning.

Now it is important, at this stage, not to overstate our case. For every student is plainly bound to recognize the extent to which these elemental factors have entered into the growth of the different religions. That is a simple matter of known fact. It is plain enough that religious origins run back into social origins: for man is a social and religious creature. It is clear that dance and song and ceremonial have a large element of sex-life in them, that taboo is of partly biological origin. Thus the world-wide myth of the Vegetation-God, always dying and always rising again, does reflect the profound needs and experiences of the primitive life of early culture. It is clear that elements in the Christian culture can be traced back to dim and bloody origins. It is probable that Psychology will lead us here and there to question the records of supposed events. There is nothing whatever to gain from obscuring this. Nor can one see what value religion could have if it did not offer a genuine satisfaction to the primal needs of the human race. But it seems to me to be little short of childish to suppose that such study of the more primitive elements which are taken up into all the higher religions, proves, *eo ipso*, that there is

PSYCHOLOGY AND THEOLOGY

no God ! As well suppose that to trace the long process by which natural science has moved out from the superstitious magic of its beginnings to its magnificent present-day achievements, proves that the world it examines is illusory. This is the argument which, in all solemnity, is applied by some psychological investigators to the Object which religion has ever sought. In other words, we can recognize in this tendency a new form of the fallacy which confuses "origin" with "validity." The ground has shifted from the old-fashioned "materialism" to a consuming interest in psychology. But, though we call nowadays for a different piper, we find that he often plays the same old tune. The methods of Science have undergone a change. Its dominant categories to-day are not—as for the Victorians—mechanistic : it works in terms of energy, life and purpose. But, though its premises have altered, it argues to a similar conclusion. The older Science, starting from physical facts, said that mind was a by-product of matter. (The technical word was epi-phenomenon.) In our day there are students of psychic or mental facts who maintain that God is a by-product of mind.

But both conclusions are equally illegitimate ; for both ignore the line of demarcation between Science and Philosophy. A good example of how that real distinction should affect psychological investigation is afforded by a recent examination by Dr Mitchell of the light thrown by psycho-analysis on the recorded facts of Spiritism. Dr Mitchell establishes the possibility (which Baudouin reached along a different line) that the "control" with which

CHRISTIANITY AND PSYCHOLOGY

mediums claim intercourse may be their own "secondary" (dissociated) personalities. But you cannot conclude from that (even if it were proved) that the knowledge they claim to obtain is mere delusion. Because, as he says, there are two quite separate problems :

1. The actual mechanism of mediumship, which it is for psychology to describe ; and
2. The source of the supernormal knowledge which the mediums do undoubtedly obtain. That is for metaphysics to explain.¹

It will be seen that this is closely parallel to the problem raised by Dr Kirsopp Lake, and suggests at once the right method of approach. Psychology must supply us with the facts about the human mind and its experiences, of which the religious experience is one. It is then the task of Theology to explain what kind of Universe it is in which such experiences occur—*i.e.* in the end to ask, What is God like ? But Science must not beg the question before it asks Theology to answer it. Because we begin to know how things are done, we cannot simply assume that God doesn't do them.

God may, for example, work through the mental machinery disclosed by the laws of suggestion and auto-suggestion : we have seen that Christ, in effect, taught that He does so. But it is neither science nor philosophy to assume that this proves that God does not exist ! Again, that belief in God is a psychological necessity if the mind is to be fully unified we have ourselves emphatically affirmed

¹ *Psychic Research Quarterly*, July 1920. (Now called *Psycho.*)

PSYCHOLOGY AND THEOLOGY

(p. 71). No doubt to describe the psychological history of a belief is not the same thing as to prove the belief is true—though Cardinal Newman tended to think it was. But neither is it, on the other hand, a clear proof that the belief is false.¹ The psychological necessity may be itself an expression of that fact which is recognized in the belief in God.

We shall, therefore, be ready to receive and welcome whatever new facts Psychology has to teach us ; and if these new facts should seriously affect any traditional assertions of Theology, we must be prepared to revise our Theology in accordance with new revelations of truth. But if Psychology goes further, and claims to supersede Theology and reign as monarch in a godless world, we shall do well to remember the earlier parallels, and confine ourselves to a more scientific course.

¹ As Tansley (pp. 135-138) assumes.

CHAPTER IX.

PSYCHOLOGY AND THE CHRISTIAN FAITH.

BUT Christian Theology need not be content to stand thus cautiously on the defensive. We can do something far more enterprising. For it can, I believe, be fairly and honestly argued that the facts with which psychology is occupied, and the methods which psycho-therapy employs, really *presuppose*, as their own postulate, the Christian interpretation of the Universe, and will only "work" if that is assumed to be true. "Suggestion points inevitably beyond itself towards Faith as its ultimate goal."¹ We have already shown that psycho-therapy is at least compatible with Christianity. I make bold to suggest now that it will only work on the Christian hypothesis. That is, that unless the Christian faith is true, psycho-therapy itself collapses. Psychology presents you with a problem which has no solution apart from Christianity. Without God it will simply not make sense. Unless we start with God we shall get nowhere.

Psychology has a very great deal to tell us about the restoration of personality, making us one, giving us free self-expression by the removal of obstructive forces. But by what possible right does psychology speak of "self" or "personality" at all? Which of our many "selves" are we to express? It is

¹ W. Brown, *op. cit.*, p. 123.

PSYCHOLOGY AND THE CHRISTIAN FAITH

tacitly taking something for granted here which it cannot deduce from its own subject-matter. It is assuming that we have already a knowledge of the ideal of Personality to which to conform the individual life. But we have not, from psychology alone. It is an idea brought in from elsewhere. If we move on the strictly psychological level, we have merely a chaos of "complexes" and impulses, each of which may claim to be the man—in extreme cases several of them do so—fragmentary, unco-ordinated, fighting trucelessly but without decision, competing with one another for expression. And that is all that we have the right to know if we have psychology for our only guide. There is no hope for them of integration into concrete, living Personality. I cannot see that we have any real right to speak of Personality at all. The more we know of the deep unconscious belt which surrounds the narrow strip of waking consciousness, the more we are able to trace the flaws and fissures which run across the bed of our psychic life, isolating parts of our conscious selves like fauna stranded in uninhabited islands, the less possible does it become to take what we call personality for granted. Are we "one" or are we "many"? The old question of the Greek philosophers confronts us now again with added force. There is nothing in the facts themselves to show. It sometimes seems as though psycho-therapeutics were faced with the spectacle of Humpty-Dumpty—a tragic heap of fragmentary egg-shells. And :

" All the king's horses, and all the king's men
Couldn't put Humpty-Dumpty together again "

CHRISTIANITY AND PSYCHOLOGY

—unless they knew he was meant to be an egg. But we cannot tell that by looking at the shells. That is, psychology is bound to start—to use the technical language of philosophy—with an *a priori* judgment about the existence and meaning of Personality. It is bound to assume that there is such a thing as a single and unified personal life, in which the conflicts and discords of the individual subject can be reconciled. Each of the subjects A, B and C must have an “ideal” personality to which his life ought to be conformed. But that inevitable assumption at once drives you a step further back. How can there be an intelligible ideal for an unlimited number of different selves unless there be a Perfect Personality, ground and archetype of the different selves, of the nature of which A, B and C partake? All the objections against radical “pluralism” bear with full force on this point. It is impossible to say that there is an ideal life for each unless there is an ideal life for all. Thus there must be, in the nature of Reality, some fixed ideal and goal of personal life before you can have any warrant for assuming that there is an ideal life for the individual. But an ideal of personality cannot be other than personal itself. And if it is an ideal for all persons, it cannot be one person among others: it must be a perfect all-including life from which all other persons derive their meaning. We must therefore start with the recognition of God as the pre-condition of perfected human life. Without the fundamental assumption—the starting-point of Religion and Theology, at any rate in the Christian forms we know—of Personality at the back of things, there is no possibility

PSYCHOLOGY AND THE CHRISTIAN FAITH

of constructive thinking. You are simply left with a list of insoluble problems. It is, I submit, increasingly forced upon us that no attempt at healing personality is scientifically possible, and no talk about personality at all is logically justifiable, unless there is Personality behind the Universe. On no other terms will psychology make sense. Belief in a personal God, the source and archetype of our finite personal consciousness is the only real guarantee there is for human "personality" at all.

As Prof. Webb finely says, in another connexion :

"Without that affirmation the confident assertion of man's greatness is apt to echo among the desolate spaces of a Universe wherein this evanescent Personality seems to count for nothing, like the voice of a child shouting to keep his courage up among mountain solitudes by night."¹

Thus it turns out that the very interpretation which some psychologists claim to have made obsolete—the faith in God or Perfect Personality as the very meaning of the Universe—must be brought back as a necessary assumption before Psychology can itself "make sense." The Personality of God is the condition of solving the problems which are dealt with by Psychology.

People often ask us to *prove* our faith in God. It cannot be done. It is just like asking us to prove there is such a thing as Truth. You cannot, of course; because unless there is, on what grounds can it be claimed that your proof is true? You cannot

¹ C. J. Webb, *God and Human Personality*, p. 168.

CHRISTIANITY AND PSYCHOLOGY

start thinking without some assumptions ; you must assume that there is Truth to be known (*i.e.* that the world is more than a lunatic asylum), and that human minds can know it (*i.e.* that not all of us are lunatics). And every piece of successful thinking, as well as every instance of right action, go to confirm the rightness of your assumption. Even in purely intellectual questions there must be an initial act of faith. The more sense you manage to make of the Universe on the basis of that first assumption, the more it is shown to have been justified. It is different only in the sense that the issues involved are more far-reaching and tremendous with the alleged " proof " of God's existence. It is a venture which all advance in knowledge, and all success in the art of living rightly, shows to be justified and, indeed, inevitable. So here, we have shown, I think, that if we start with the faith in a Personal God to explain the Universe, psychology makes sense ; but not without it. That is, so far as it goes, a positive result for the theologian.

But, if we get so far, the inner necessity of the argument itself is bound to take us at least one step further. Not merely Theism seems to be demanded before psychology can do its work, but something very much like Christian Theism.

Our argument, so far, seems to have demanded as the very condition of our self-hood a Perfect Personality at the heart of things, standing over against our finiteness as fully and completely personal. In this sense, God must be, as we say, transcendent—Other than we, the Source and Ground of ourselves, perfect by contrast with our imperfection. But if

PSYCHOLOGY AND THE CHRISTIAN FAITH

we stop there it is merely a logical fact, of no really practical importance. For even if we know that there exists somehow and somewhere a Perfect Personality, to try and become like Him is absurd. Perfect Personality, as Lotze said, is in God only. But that leads rather to despair than hope. There is a great gulf fixed—and who can bridge it? God must do it or it cannot be done. That is to say, that God must be *within* us, Himself the Bridge that leads from earth to heaven, leading us back again to His own perfection, expressing Himself through human personality. And here we touch the root of the whole question—the real basis of all that we have been saying. The spacious creed of Christianity offers a satisfying solution here.

It is striking how the best recent philosophy is increasingly emphasizing this conception. It is true that some of the old credal statements, and some of the language of our Prayer-book, tend to suggest a Divine transcendence which is self-centred and self-complete, wholly removed from the life of finite persons. But this breaks down, since it will not satisfactorily explain our own deepest experiences. “The essence of human nature,” as Professor Pringle-Pattison has put it, “is just . . . the contrast between the actual present and the unrealized future, passing into the deeper contrast between the ‘is’ and the ‘ought-to-be,’ and the duality of what is commonly called the lower and the higher self, with the discord and the struggle thence resulting. *The process of such a life is explicable only through the actual presence within it, or to it, of the Perfection to which it aspires . . . Transcendence . . . refers to a*

CHRISTIANITY AND PSYCHOLOGY

distinction of value or quality, not to the ontological separateness of one being from another. . . . The Productive Reason remains at once the sustaining element of the dependent life, and the living content continually offering itself to the soul which it has awakened to the knowledge and quest of itself.”¹

We can reach the same point from another line of approach. The investigation of psycho-neuroses, and, indeed, nearly all the study of psychology is concerned in a greater or a less degree with abnormalities in the human mind. It aims, as we have noticed a moment ago, at unifying personality—at making people what they are meant to be. But how do we know what they are meant to be? “No one,” says Dr Brown, “is completely normal.”² We can give full value to individual freedom; we can shrink from forcing a standardized mould on to any other personality, leaving it free “to develop along its own lines.” But, even so, there must be some standard of reference. For progress presupposes a fixed goal. You cannot try to “develop” personality unless you know towards what it should develop. A completely practical need thus corresponds here with what we have urged to be logical necessity. We must have an objective standard of personality.

Now Christians claim, and nearly all men would admit, that the most complete expression of personality which can be found in the records of our race, is the character of Jesus of Nazareth. But this perfect human Personality was, so the Christian

¹ *The Idea of God*, pp. 254-255 (my italics).

² *Op. cit.*, p. 96.

PSYCHOLOGY AND THE CHRISTIAN FAITH

consciousness asserts, the highest manifestation in human history of the archetypal Personality. He was “the effulgence of God’s glory and the very portrait of His Character.”¹ That is to say, that in His human character the personal Being of God is realized under the conditions of time and space. But this Personality would have no significance for the thought or the moral strivings of mankind unless it were indeed the manifestation of the God of Nature—the Ground of the natural order. Otherwise, He but mocks our aspirations; for otherwise, this perfected human character has no roots in the deepest structure of Reality. That conviction the Christian Church asserts in the famous “Homo-ousion.” Christ, it says, is “of one Essence” with the Father. That is to say, His perfect Personality is the expression and the guarantee of the Reality behind the Universe. Only in a real Incarnation have we a truly “normal” Personality.

Here, then, we reach a conception of Personality which satisfies psychological requirements as well as philosophical necessity. We do not blur the real distinction between the conditioned and the infinite. We do not, with “absolute idealism,” hold that God is exhausted in His world, or obliterate the possibility, on which all genuine religion rests, of intercourse between finite personalities and the perfect God by whom they were created and upon whose will their existence is dependent. On all

¹ Heb. i. 3, *εἰκὼν τῆς ὑποστάσεως*. I think this a fair translation, for although the thought-forms of Greek Philosophy had no room for personality in our sense, yet “hypostasis” means “What makes God, God.”

CHRISTIANITY AND PSYCHOLOGY

this, rather, we throw the stronger emphasis. But we claim that, in moral and spiritual union with the perfect Being of God, Jesus has shown as no other before or since, the real meaning of human personality—the personality which is truly normal. This accords with the whole Christian world-view, which holds that the natural only becomes itself—only realizes its own nature fully—when it is permeated by the supernatural.

If this be admitted, it takes us a long way. I will try to sketch now in the barest outline how Christian thought would work out the development which follows from this conception of personality, which alone seems to satisfy the demands we have made.

Anyone listening to the previous lectures may possibly have been raising one objection which is perfectly fair, and ought to be fairly met. It may have seemed as though I were suggesting that the problem in the lives of all of us were primarily one of self-direction. It may have seemed as though I conceived religion as just an activity of the human will, a deliberate setting of ourselves towards the attainment of an ideal purpose. That is really the negation of religion ; it is the last position I would defend. It assumes that we are “Captains of our souls”—which all of us know to our cost that we are not. If what Theology calls Pelagianism—“you can be good if you will”—were a true statement, the problem of life would be simpler than it is. Everyone realizes how inadequately this position describes the horrid facts. Even supposing it were true, we have still to discover what can make us will. But, apart from that, we shall all, I suppose,

PSYCHOLOGY AND THE CHRISTIAN FAITH

agree that any suggestion that the spring or origin of the religious life can be found in any motives of our own is in flagrant contradiction to the deepest experiences of religion. It is clear, at any rate, that for a Christian, the very perception of a divine ideal is due to the work of God within the soul. "Thou wouldest not have been seeking for Me, if thou hadst not already found Me." It is the influence of Christ upon us—that is, the working of His Spirit in us—that makes us desire to follow His example. So that the vision of the Kingdom of God in any way which affects our desires and wills is itself the gift or "grace" of God. The presence of the Spirit has been presupposed in every line of our discussion, which will only "work" if this is a real fact.

A religion that is merely an attempt, however noble, at reaching an ideal, must be a religion of impotent despair. The Stoics were quite logical in adding suicide as the practical culmination of their system. But Christianity cannot be described as the pursuit of an ideal: it is rather an ideal pursuing us. It is a City coming down from Heaven—the Word made flesh, and dwelling among men. The whole hope and genius of Christianity as a redemption of our wills and instincts depends entirely on the Incarnation. God took upon Himself man to deliver him, clothed Himself in concrete human nature, physical and psychological, to make it the instrument of His own perfection.

It goes without saying that an Incarnation is only possible if man is, from the first, made "in the image of God." What we are by nature always has been

CHRISTIANITY AND PSYCHOLOGY

divine, in the sense that we are made for God. Our instincts come from God : they are God's gift : it is "natural" for them to be sublimated in progressively moral and spiritual activities. God is the innermost core of our personal selves, the best we have in us to become, and we are ourselves when we are most like God. We attain the true goal of our life only when God is expressing Himself through us ; and this in no nebulous pantheistic sense. God expresses Himself through human life when there is a real moral union between our human desires and wills and His : when the influence of His Spirit in us has so purified and hallowed our impulses and desires that we will what He wills. Then our actions express the life of God.

"Our wills are ours to make them thine" ; and only then are they truly our own.

The Incarnation makes this possible. For, if we follow the lines we have laid down previously, we shall hold that the very essence of personality is the continuity of purpose. It is purpose (or will) that makes a man one, not many. And the "character" of a man verifies itself in the dominant purpose which gives his life its unity. We are bound to hold that in symbol and analogy this is also true of the Divine life, so that the revelation of God's purpose is the revelation of God's character. Jesus revealed the character of God by His manifestation of the Father's purpose. "The Son does nothing of Himself but whatsoever He sees the Father doing." In Him we behold the will of God in action. He, then, that has seen Him has seen the Father. It is perfectly true, as the Catholic Church maintains,

PSYCHOLOGY AND THE CHRISTIAN FAITH

that our Lord was God, living a human life. In that perfect union of will with the Father's will, caused by God's initiative act when Jesus was conceived by the Holy Ghost, revealing deeper reaches in God's purposes as the Boy "grew in wisdom and in stature," God expressed Himself through a Man's life. And henceforth, for us Christians, "the Voice of God within us speaks in the tones of Jesus of Nazareth."¹

But this is no mere event in history: it is the supreme contemporary Fact. All those who yield to the influence of Jesus are "given the right to become the sons of God"—to share, in their measure and degree, the purpose and so the life of the Heavenly Father. The acceptance of this gift is eternal life. "He became man"—as the early Christian thinkers did not hesitate to say—"in order that man might become divine." It is possible that the Greeks who used this phrase thought of it as implying a change of essence—a passing from "corruptible" mortality into the "incorrputible essence" of Deity. For us, the interpretation will be different. It must needs be moral rather than metaphysical. We can think of it, probably, only in terms of purpose. Yet their magnificent claim does remain valid. The Incarnation was quite definitely an irruption of supernatural life into the field of human personality—"taking Manhood into God"—that the wills and faculties which were made for God should return to that perfection from which they came. This is the spirit of Leo's great prayer: "Let the whole world see that things

¹ Inge's *Outspoken Essays*, Second Series, p. 54.

CHRISTIANITY AND PSYCHOLOGY

which were cast down are being raised up, that things which had grown old are being made new, and that all things are returning to perfection through Him from whom they took their origin." It is also the spirit of the Lord's own prayer : *Our Father, Thy will be done on earth as it is in Heaven* ; may the Perfection which God is eternally, be realized in the temporal life of men.

We have here, I think, the most promising approach towards a satisfying Christology. But also we can see, very clearly, how the doctrine of the Incarnation, thus brought into touch with psychological facts, works itself out in the teaching of the Church.

Let us recall at this point an important fact to which reference was made in an earlier lecture—that instincts which, in themselves, are self-destructive, are harmonized and raised to their highest power when they are directed to a *social* end. "The greatest and permanent power comes to him who uses it not for his own personal ends, but for the good of his fellows ; for only by such a use of it does he achieve the maximum inner harmony."¹

We remember then, with perhaps new understanding, that the goal of Christian life (whenever Christian thought has remained true to its own special genius) has always been held to be incorporation into a Fellowship of the Spirit, who is the Spirit of Incarnate God. The Spirit always creates Fellowship ; the activities of the Spirit are social activities ; the decisive moment of Pentecost, for example, brought to birth for the first time in human

¹ Dr Hadfield ("Psychology of Power") in *The Spirit*, p. 94.

PSYCHOLOGY AND THE CHRISTIAN FAITH

history the ideal expression of human social life. The Divine life expresses itself in Fellowship. We live, says psychology, at the highest level of power and freedom and effectiveness when we are most completely socialized. We become ourselves, says Christianity, when we are caught up into a Divine Society—the perfect expression of Him “who altogether in all men is coming to His fulfilment” (Eph. i. 23). That is the true goal and consummation of the social instinct which for countless æons has been driving us down the ways of history, modifying and in part controlling the operation of all our other instincts, guiding the racial life without its knowledge, and some of us definitely against our will, into that which man is meant to be as the son and the image of God who is perfect Fellowship—the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ.

The difference between our modern Christian outlook and that of New Testament Christianity is nowhere seen more strikingly than in this. We tend to think in terms of individual Christians, and ask how we are to draw them into Fellowship. That is partly an inheritance from the break-up of the Holy Roman Empire, and the reaction which caused the Reformation. But it is miles away from the New Testament, which thinks almost entirely in social terms. An individual Christian is, to it, the Fellowship living at that “growing point.” Salvation is thought of in terms of the Fellowship. The fulfilment of the Christ is conceived as possible not in the individual but in the life of the completed Fellowship. The deeper intuitions of Christianity are thus significantly in accord with the science of

CHRISTIANITY AND PSYCHOLOGY

our more modern age. May we not here begin to see a glimpse of what it is that the Church has really meant by professing its belief in a Holy Spirit—the “Giver of life” and Power, and the Spirit of Fellowship? Power and Fellowship, perhaps, are one. The love of God, the influence of Christ, the Fellowship created by the Spirit (2 Cor. xiii. 14)—are not these the very axioms underlying the whole of our inquiry?

I can do no more here than throw out this hint; but it will, I believe, be found in a little while when the facts are established a little more securely, and Christian thought has had time to get to work on them, that psychology (and especially social psychology) will supply us with the data and the vocabulary for a true theology of the Holy Spirit. So far, it has been appallingly neglected, and most of our teaching on this vital matter is lamentably arid and conventional. Nowhere is “restatement” more imperative.

Another point at which Christianity, by its belief in an Incarnation, offers a very definite contribution, is where it touches the terribly tangled problem of what is popularly called free-will.

It is often vehemently asserted, by Freud, for example, and his English followers, that the myth of free-will has been finally exploded by the scientific treatment of mental processes. But this appears to be unwarrantable. Obviously, if psychology aspires to be a science among sciences it is bound to proceed by scientific methods. Scientific research becomes impossible without the postulate of cause and effect—or, better, consequent and antecedent.

PSYCHOLOGY AND THE CHRISTIAN FAITH

Once admit an event which has no cause, and there is an end of the scientist's inquiry. It is thus from the very start inevitable, *as a question of scientific procedure*, for the psychologist to assume that, for every event in the mental life which is the subject of his researches, there is to be found an antecedent to which the event concerned can be traced. No fruitful work can be done on other terms. But, as Professor Sorley has pointed out, to establish a causal connexion in this way between the successive states of my consciousness, does not really touch the problem of freedom. For the psychologist they are "mental states": but for me they are *my* mental states, and a whole Philosophy is involved in that. They are different intrinsically from your or any one else's mental states, just because I am I, and you are you. In other words, the necessary postulate that each state depends on one preceding it, does not in any vital way affect the freedom of the essential inner self. Science is bound to work by abstraction: but in living fact there is really no such thing as a mental state considered in abstraction: there are only states of the minds of definite persons. The freedom of the concrete personality, whose mental states they are, is left untouched by this "determinism."¹ A distinguished psychologist has made the same point. Dr W. Brown says it is the most serious objection against the psycho-analytical school of thought "that it restricts itself unduly to the investigation of the instinctive bases of mental life . . . and fails to do justice to the nature of volition or other of the higher forms of mental

¹ Cf. Sorley, *Moral Values and the Idea of God*, pp. 448-452.

CHRISTIANITY AND PSYCHOLOGY

activity. It has no right to deny personal responsibility, seeing that it has not yet begun to deal with the concept of responsibility at all.”¹

Moreover, there can be no real freedom unless there is some degree of determinism. Unless I can calculate that given causes will inevitably give rise to their effects, life becomes a mere gamble, not a plan. It is only through the unswerving, consistent laws by which the phenomenal world is governed that my real self can express itself in act. *If nature were entirely contingent, then man could not be free.* And this dependable sequence of cause and effect seems (if one thinks it out) to be as necessary in the psychic life as it is in the physical world, if moral freedom is to be truly realized.

Dr Crichton Miller, indeed, has recently claimed that one result of the New Psychology is to enlarge the field of moral freedom. “It is encroaching (he says) on the territory of determinism in two directions. On the one hand, it shows that certain of the so-called “blind” forces which act destructively on the life of the individual and the community, can be brought into relation with conscious control. On the other hand, it discredits that type of spiritual determinism which underestimates the individual’s own part in the discovery of truth and moral goodness, and makes him dependent on an external authority and a magical solution. Both the depths and heights of human achievement are the expression of a purpose and a will that is an integral part of a

¹ “Responsibility and Modern Psychology,” in *Psyche*, Oct. 1922, pp. 135-136.

PSYCHOLOGY AND THE CHRISTIAN FAITH

man's mind, although it be no part of his consciousness.”¹

At the same time, when we have given the fullest weight to all that can be said on this side of the question, it remains true that the whole lesson of psychology warns us that we are not born free. All of us are selves in the making. Freedom is something to be realized: it is not an axiom, but an achievement. It is not a possession we can take for granted. We become free only when our whole selves are caught up into a harmonious controlling purpose to which every element in our nature is loyal: and that, in the fullest Christian sense, is Love.² One alone, of all the sons of men, has wholly and completely known such freedom. If, therefore, the Son shall set us free, then—but only then—we are free indeed. It needs a person to liberate personality: and Jesus is the greatest of emancipators.

He was free because, in every action He accepted the restraint of Sonship—learning obedience by what He suffered. He was free, because every desire and thought and impulse in Him was in perfect harmony with perfect love, *i.e.* with the will of His Father who is in Heaven, whom He therefore perfectly revealed; and because no act or desire was ever His which did not perfectly express His deepest self—that is, the Spirit of God indwelling Him. So that the Lord—as St Paul says—is the Spirit. That Spirit, as it is imparted to us, gives us

¹ C. Miller, *The New Psychology and the Teacher*, pp. 136-139.

² “Love,” said St Paul, “is the unifying force of a fully-developed life” (*σύνδεσμος τῆς τελειότητος*), Col. iii. 15.

CHRISTIANITY AND PSYCHOLOGY

the right to become the sons of God—*i.e.* freedom to become ourselves. If we could say, “Not I, but Christ lives in me,” we should have attained to our full self-expression. We should be free with that autonomy which is (as Webb says)¹ indeed “Theonomy.” *Deo servire libertas*: Surrender is the way of perfect freedom. We become ourselves when we find ourselves in God.

¹ Webb, *op. cit.*, p. 132.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

THE following books are recommended to the reader who wishes to start on the study of this subject. Most of them have been referred to in the text.

- HART - - *The Psychology of Insanity*. (Cambridge University Press. 2s. 6d.)
- MYERS - - *Experimental Psychology*. (Cambridge. 2s. 6d.)
- TANSLEY - - *The New Psychology*. (Allen & Unwin. 10s. 6d.)
- MCDougall *Introduction to Social Psychology*. (Methuen. 7s. 6d.)
- HOBHOUSE - *Mind in Evolution*. (Macmillan. 12s. 6d.)
- W. JAMES - *Text-book of Psychology*. Largely physiological. (Macmillan. 8s. 6d.)
Varieties of Religious Experience. (Longmans. 16s.)
- M. NICOLL - *Dream Psychology*. (Oxford. 8s. 6d.)
- TROTTER - - *Instincts of the Herd in Peace and War*. (T. Fisher Unwin. 8s. 6d.)
- STREETER - (Edited by) *The Spirit*. (Macmillan. 10s. 6d.)
- PYM - - - *Psychology and the Christian Life*. (S.C.M. 2s. 6d.)
- BAUDOUIN - *Suggestion and Auto-Suggestion*. (Allen & Unwin. 10s. 6d.)
- PRATT - - *The Religious Consciousness*. (Macmillan. N.Y. 22s.)
- W. TEMPLE - *The Nature of Personality*. (Macmillan. 9s.)
- C. J. WEBB - *God and Personality*. Gifford Lectures. 2 Vols. (Allen & Unwin. 12s. 6d.)
- FREUD - - *Psycho-pathology of Everyday Life*. (T. Fisher Unwin. 12s. 6d.)
- W. BROWN - *Suggestion and Mental Analysis*. (London University Press. 3s. 6d.)
- C. MILLER - *The New Psychology and the Teacher*. (Jarrold. 6s.)
- THOULESS - *Introduction to the Psychology of Religion*. (Cambridge University Press. 7s. 6d.)

INDEX

- Aristotle, 54 f.
Association, 28 f.
Auto-suggestion (*see* Suggestion).

Baptism, 62, 105.
Baudouin, 41, 44 f., 51, 114.
Bevan, E. R., 151.
Bousfield, 108.
Brown, 189.

Censor, 104.
Church, the, 32, 127, 186 f.
Clergy, 66 f., 79 f., 86.
Complexes, 28, 77.
Confession, 83 ff.
Contemplation, 144.
Conversion, 68, 71.
Coué, 41, 111, 114.
Creative instinct, 91 ff.

Darwin, 9, 163.
Delinquency, moral, 57.
Demoniac possession, 37, 150.
Determinism (*see* Freewill).
Discords, 35, 71 ff.
Dissociation, 36.
Docetism, 131.
Dreams, 38 f., 132 f.
Durkheim, 169.

Elliott-Smith, 169.
Emotionalism, 134 ff.
Eucharist, 112.
Evolution, 9 f., 163 f.
Experience, religious, 122 f.

Faith, 149 ff.
Fatigue, 140.
Fear, 149 ff.
Fellowship, 186 f.
Forgiveness, 82 f.
Freewill, 188 ff.
Freud, 24 f., 104, 166, 188.

Guilt, 82 f.

Habits, religious, 62 f.
Hadfield, 21, 140 f.
Hart, 28, 31.
Herd instinct, 18, 40, 90, 129, 169.
Hetero-suggestion (*see* Suggestion).
Hypnotism, 44.

Imagination, 50, 145.
Incarnation, 183 f.
Instinct, 9 ff., 87 ff.
Intelligence (*see* Reason).
Intuition, 5.

James, Wm., 134.
Jesus Christ, 58 f., 71 ff., 99 ff., 109 f., 142, 147 ff., 152 ff., 180 ff.
Jung, 24 f., 128, 133, 168.

Kingdom of God, 75 f., 81, 93 f.

Mark ix. 22; 49.
M'Dougall, 16, 51, 94.
Miller, Crichton, 68, 190.
Motive, unconscious, 56.
Myers, 23.

New Nancy School (*see* Coué).

Orthodoxy, 32 f.

Paul, St, 19, 69 f., 82.
Personality, 78 f., 174 ff.
Perversion, 20, 103, 137.
Power, 138 ff.
Pragmatism, 123 f.
Pratt, 162 f.
Prayer, 99 ff., 144 f.
Prayer-book revision, 126 f.

INDEX

- | | |
|---|---|
| Prophets, 105, 118. | Sex, 18, 39 f., 90 ff., 103, 168. |
| Psycho-therapy, 11, 41, 47 f., 104, 108. | Sin, 58, 88 f. |
| Pugnacity, 93. | Social instinct (<i>see</i> Herd instinct). |
| Rashdall, 125. | Sorley, 189. |
| Rationalization, 29 ff., 37. | Spiritual healing, 109 ff. |
| Reason, 5, 12, 20, 30, 120 f. | Subconscious (<i>see</i> Unconscious). |
| Reflex action, 14 f. | Sublimation, 21, 91. |
| Repression, 25, 38. | Subliminal self (<i>see</i> Unconscious). |
| Reversed Effort, Law of, 50 ff. | Suggestion, 41 ff., 99 ff., 146 f., 172 f. |
| Rivers, 168. | Temptation, 66, 89 f., 114. |
| Romans vii. 7; 19, 69. | Theology, 158 ff. |
| Sabatier, 119. | Trotter, 18. |
| Sacraments, 106 f. | Unconscious, The, 7, 23 ff., 45, 161 f. |
| Schweitzer, 151 f. | Unification, 69 ff., 76. |
| Science and religion, 163 ff. | Will, 41 ff., 50 ff. |
| Self-realization, 75. | |
| Service, 74 f. | |

STUDENT CHRISTIAN MOVEMENT

The amazing life story of a Japanese murderer, written by himself in prison, after his conversion, and while awaiting his execution.

A Gentleman in Prison

**The Story of TOKICHI ISHII,
written in Tokyo Prison**

Translated by CAROLINE MACDONALD, and with a Foreword by JOHN KELMAN, D.D. Crown 8vo, with four illustrations, **4s. 6d. net.**

"One of the world's great stories. There is in it something of the glamour of 'The Arabian Nights,' and something of the naked hellishness of Poe's 'Tales of Mystery.' There is also the most realistic vision I have ever seen of Jesus Christ finding one of the lost."—*From the Foreword.*

The second volume in our new "Modern Series of Missionary Biographies"

Alexander Duff: Pioneer of Missionary Education

By WILLIAM PATON, M.A., Joint-Author of "The Highway of God," and Author of "Social Ideals in India," etc. Crown 8vo. **5s. net.**

This book tells the story of a creative personality and a great movement.

Second Edition

Studies in the Teaching of the Sermon on the Mount

By A. W. ROBINSON, D.D., Canon of Canterbury. Crown 8vo. **3s. 6d. net.** Paper, **2s. net.**

"The little book is characterised by a winning simplicity, by sanity of judgment, and by absolute sincerity. It is as if a wise and kindly man were talking to one on the central things beside his study fire quite naturally without any strain."—*Expository Times.*

NOTABLE BOOKS FROM OUR LIST

Second Large Edition Ready

Men, Women and God. A Discussion of Sex Questions from the Christian Point of View

By A. HERBERT GRAY, M.A., D.D., Author of "The Christian Adventure," "As Tommy Sees Us," etc. With an Appendix on "Some of the Physiological Facts," by A. CHARLES E. GRAY, M.D. (Edin.). Crown 8vo. **4s. net.** Paper, **3s. net.** Postage 4d.

CONTENTS.—Knowing the Facts; Comradeship; Love; Falling in Love and getting Engaged; Our Moral Standards; A Man's Struggle; Prostitution—a Chapter for Men; A Girl's Early Days; Involuntary Celibacy; The Art of being Married; Unhappy Marriages; The Influence of Social Conditions; Forgetting the Things which are Behind.

"This book can be placed in the hands of young people of either sex, and there are few such, few married people, and fewer parents who would not receive from it counsel helpful in the highest degree."

—*Glasgow Herald*.

In the Press

The Certainty of God

By W. J. MOULTON, M.A., B.D., Principal of Didsbury College, Manchester. Crown 8vo. **3s. 6d. net.** Paper, **2s. 6d. net.**

CONTENTS.—Religion and Life; Our Faith in God; The Meaning of Jesus Christ; Jesus Christ and History; The Fuel of Sin; The Meaning of the Cross; The Fact of Conversion; The Social Consequences of Salvation.

Second Impression

Everyday Religion

By E. S. WOODS, M.A., Author of "Modern Discipleship and What it Means," etc. Crown 8vo. **5s. net.**

CONTENTS.—The Problem of Living Together; Sharing Life; Christianity and Work—Money—Thought—Beauty—Recreation—Sex—Health, etc.

"This book is written in an eminently practical and broad vein and is inspired with a helpful optimism."—*The Times*.

WRITE FOR DETAILED PUBLICATION LIST

STUDENT CHRISTIAN MOVEMENT

The Lord of Thought. A Study of the Problems which confronted Jesus Christ and the Solution He offered

By Miss LILY DOUGALL, Author of "Pro Christo et Ecclesia," and C. W. EMMET, B.D., Fellow of University College, Oxford. Demy 8vo. **12s. 6d.** net.

"A fascinating and learned book on the mind of Christ, and how it was influenced by the Jewish literature of His own time, has been written by Miss Lily Dougall and C. W. Emmet, a conjunction of names to make any book bearing it a book to read."—*Public Opinion*.

Personal Immortality. An Enquiry into the Christian Doctrine of a Future Life

By A. GORDON JAMES. Crown 8vo. **3s. 6d.** net.

CONTENTS.—Dreams of Immortality; The Christian Position; Heaven; Hell; Purgatory, and Prayers for the Dead; The Communion of Saints; The Day of Judgment; The Challenge of To-day.

Our Faith in God. Its Reasonableness, Necessity, Effectiveness and Finality

By J. ERNEST DAVEY, M.A. (Cantab.), B.D. (Edin.), Professor of Ecclesiastical History, General Assembly's College, Belfast, Fellow of King's College, Cambridge. Crown 8vo. **3s. 6d.** net. Paper, **2s. 6d.** net.

Thoughts on Unity

By Rt. Rev. NEVILLE S. TALBOT, Bishop of Pretoria. Crown 8vo. **3s. 6d.** net.

"Perhaps the most important contribution we have had to the human side of the Reunion question. . . . He must be narrow and bigoted indeed who can deny its inspiring Christianity, its wide outlook, and absolute impartiality."—*The Guardian*.

WHEN IN LONDON VISIT OUR BOOK ROOM

NOTABLE BOOKS FROM OUR LIST

Second Impression

The Pilgrim. Essays on Religion

By T. R. GLOVER, M.A., LL.D., Author of "The Jesus of History." Crown 8vo. **6s.** net.

"The essays are all full of the charm which we have learnt to expect from Dr Glover. Not one of them is lacking in a certain distinction, and they are all worthy of preservation, not simply for what each of them specifically has to tell us, but quite as much for their help in giving us the right outlook needed for the study of the Bible and of religion generally. . . . Many readers will cherish this book as a companion to whom they will often be glad to turn for stimulus and encouragement."—*Westminster Gazette*.

Vital Forces of the Early Church

By Prof. H. A. A. KENNEDY, D.D., D.Sc. Crown 8vo. **3s.** net.

"A book with much freshly-put matter grouped under the heading of ideas specially prominent in the Early Church, viz., Equality, Fraternity, Liberty, Conversion, the New Age, the Second Coming, etc. Written by one of the leading authorities on the Apostolic Age."—*Times Literary Supplement*.

The Master Builder

A Study in the Life of the Apostle Paul

By Rev. JAMES MATHERS, B.D. Crown 8vo. **4s. 6d.** net. Paper, **3s.** net.

"Mr Mathers very nearly does for the Apostle what Dr Glover has done to reconstruct 'The Jesus of History,' and no higher praise is needed in commending 'The Master Builder.'"—*Aberdeen Free Press*.

For the Faith. Some Stories of the Missions of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries

By Miss A. H. SMALL. Crown 8vo. **4s. 6d.** net. Paper, **3s.** net.

"This interesting little work is a sympathetic study by a Protestant writer of the heroes and Saints of Roman Catholic missionary enterprise in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries."—*The Times*.

